arXiv:0801.1050v1 [math.PR] 7 Jan 2008

Moderate deviations for random fields and random complex zeroes

Boris Tsirelson

Abstract

Moderate deviations for random complex zeroes are deduced from a new theorem on moderate deviations for random fields.

Contents

1 A chain of inequalities 3

2 Splittable random processes 17

3 Logarithm of a Gaussian process 26

4 An example of a splittable process 33

5 Splittable random fields 36

6 An example of a splittable field 47

7 Random complex zeroes 53

Introduction

Recent results on moderate deviations for random complex zeroes [7] are a challenge for probability theory, since they involve complex analysis, in contrast to asymptotic normality obtained via random fields [8]. Taking up the challenge, I deduce moderate deviations for random complex zeroes from a new general theorem on moderate deviations for random fields. As a by-product, the same general theorem gives the asymptotic normality, avoiding

---

[1] This research was supported by THE ISRAEL SCIENCE FOUNDATION (grant No. 683/05).

the diagram techniques of [8]. However, I consider only smooth test functions, leaving aside interesting effects of sharp boundary [7].

The random complex zeroes are singularities of a stationary random field on the complex plane (the logarithm of the absolute value of a normalized Gaussian analytic function). This random field transcends the existing theory of moderate deviations (see [3], [4] and references therein) in several aspects:

(a) it is a random field on the plane, not a random process on the line;

(b) it has some, but not all exponential moments;

(c) it is some function of a Gaussian random field, but the function ($z \mapsto \ln|z|$) is singular at 0, which entangles moderate deviations of the non-Gaussian field with small deviations of the underlying Gaussian field;

(d) the underlying Gaussian field is non-stationary.

The first part (Sections 1–4) contains the general result in dimension one (random processes on the line). Dimension two (random fields on the plane) is treated in the second part (Sections 5–6), using the first part. The third part (Section 7) deals with random complex zeros.

Main results of the first part and the third part are formulated below.

1 Definition. A stationary random process $X = (X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is *splittable,* if $\mathbb{E}\exp|X_0| < \infty$, $\mathbb{E}\,X_0 = 0$, and there exists (on some probability space) a triple of random processes X^0, X^-, X^+ such that

(a) the two processes X^-, X^+ are independent;

(b) the four processes X, X^0, X^-, X^+ are identically distributed;

(c) $\mathbb{E}\exp\bigl(\int_{-\infty}^0 |X_t^- - X_t^0|\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^\infty |X_t^+ - X_t^0|\,\mathrm{d}t\bigr) < \infty$.

2 Theorem. For every splittable stationary random process X there exists $\sigma \in [0,\infty)$ such that for every compactly supported continuous function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{\substack{r\to\infty,\lambda\to0\\ \lambda\log r\to0}} \frac{1}{r\lambda^2}\ln\mathbb{E}\exp\lambda\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f\Bigl(\frac{t}{r}\Bigr)X_t\,\mathrm{d}t = \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\|f\|^2_{L_2(\mathbb{R})}\,.$$

That is, for every ε there exist R and δ such that the given expression is ε-close to the right-hand side for all $r \ge R$ and all $\lambda \ne 0$ such that $|\lambda|\log r \le \delta$.

3 Corollary. Let X, σ and f be as in Theorem 2, and $\sigma \ne 0$. Then

$$\lim_{\substack{r\to\infty,c\to\infty\\ (c\log r)^2/r\to0}} \frac{1}{c^2}\ln\mathbb{P}\biggl(\int f\Bigl(\frac{t}{r}\Bigr)X_t\,\mathrm{d}t \ge c\sigma\|f\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R})}\sqrt{r}\biggr) = -\frac{1}{2}\,.$$

Unfortunately, the region of moderate deviations ($r \to \infty$, $c \to \infty$, $\frac{c^2}{r} \to 0$) is not covered. The condition $\frac{(c\log r)^2}{r} \to 0$ leaves a small gap between Corollary 3 and large deviations ($\frac{c^2}{r} = \text{const}$).

4 Corollary. Let X, σ and f be as in Theorem 2. Then the distribution of $r^{-1/2}\int f\big(\frac{t}{r}\big)X_t\,\mathrm{d}t$ converges (as $r \to \infty$) to the normal distribution $N(0,\sigma^2\|f\|^2)$.

Consider now the random entire function $\psi : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$\psi(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\zeta_k z^k}{\sqrt{k!}} \,,$$

where $\zeta_0, \zeta_1, \dots$ are independent standard complex Gaussian random variables.

5 Theorem. There exists an absolute constant $\sigma \in (0,\infty)$ such that for every compactly supported C^2-function $h : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{\substack{r\to\infty,\lambda\to 0\\ \lambda\log^2 r\to 0}} \frac{1}{r^2\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E}\, \exp \lambda r^2 \bigg(\sum_{z:\psi(z)=0} h\Big(\frac{z}{r}\Big) - \frac{r^2}{\pi}\int h\,\mathrm{d}m \bigg) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\int |\Delta h|^2\,\mathrm{d}m \,;$$

here m is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{C}$, and Δh is the Laplacian of h.

6 Corollary. Let σ and h be as in Theorem 5. Then

$$\lim_{\substack{r\to\infty,c\to\infty\\ (c\log^2 r)/r\to 0}} \frac{1}{c^2} \ln \mathbb{P}\bigg(\sum_{z:\psi(z)=0} h\Big(\frac{z}{r}\Big) - \frac{r^2}{\pi}\int h\,\mathrm{d}m \ge \frac{c\sigma}{r}\sqrt{\int|\Delta h|^2\,\mathrm{d}m}\,\bigg) = -\frac{1}{2} \,.$$

The same holds for $(-h)$, of course.

7 Corollary. Let σ and h be as in Theorem 5. Then the distribution of

$$r\bigg(\sum_{z:\psi(z)=0} h\Big(\frac{z}{r}\Big) - \frac{r^2}{\pi}\int h\,\mathrm{d}m \bigg)$$

converges (as $r \to \infty$) to the normal distribution $N(0,\sigma^2\int|\Delta h|^2\,\mathrm{d}m)$.

This is the asymptotic normality established in [8] using moments and diagrams.

1 A chain of inequalities

Main results of this section, formulated below, are Theorem 1.2 (used in Sect. 2), Proposition 1.5 (also used in Sect. 2), and Proposition 1.6 (used in Sect. 5, see 5.10).

1.1 Definition. Let X, Y be random variables (possibly on different probability spaces) and $C \in [0, \infty)$. We say that Y is a *C-duplication* of X, if there exist random variables X_1, X_2, Z (on some probability space) such that

X_1 and X_2 are independent,

X_1, X_2, X are identically distributed,

$X_1 + X_2 + Z$ and Y are identically distributed,

$\ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda Z \le C\lambda^2$ for all $\lambda \in [-1, 1]$.

1.2 Theorem. Let random variables $X_1, X_2, \dots$ (possibly on different probability spaces) and numbers $C_1, C_2, \dots \in [0, \infty)$ be such that

(a) X_{n+1} is a C_n-duplication of X_n (for all $n = 1, 2, \dots$);

(b) $\sup_n \big((2\theta)^{-n} C_n \big) < \infty$ for some $\theta < 1$;

(c) $\mathbb{E} \exp \varepsilon |X_1| < \infty$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$;

(d) $\mathbb{E}\, X_1 = 0$.

Then the following limit exists:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty, \lambda n \to 0} \frac{1}{2^n \lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda X_n \,.$$

Given a function $f : (0, \infty) \to [0, \infty]$ and a number $C \in [0, \infty)$, we define another function $f_+[C] : (0, \infty) \to [0, \infty]$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & f_+[C](\lambda) = \inf_{p \in [1/(1-\lambda), \infty)} \frac{2}{p} f(p\lambda) + \frac{p}{p-1} C\lambda^2 && \text{for } \lambda \in (0,1)\,, \\ & f_+[C](\lambda) = \infty && \text{for } \lambda \in [1, \infty)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

Further, we define recursively for $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

$$f_+[C_0, \dots, C_{n+1}] = (f_+[C_0, \dots, C_n])_+[C_{n+1}]\,. \tag{1.4}$$

1.5 Proposition. For every $\varepsilon, \theta \in (0,1)$,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty, \lambda n \to 0+} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}\lambda^2} f_+[C_0, \dots, C_n](\lambda) \le$$

$$\le \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \limsup_{\lambda \to 0} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} f(\lambda) + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon(1-\sqrt{\theta})^2} \sup_n \frac{C_n}{(2\theta)^n}\,.$$

1.6 Proposition. For every $\varepsilon, \theta \in (0,1)$, n and λ,

(a) if $0 < \lambda \le \varepsilon \theta^{n/2} (1 - \sqrt{\theta})$ then

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} f_+[C_0, \dots, C_n](\lambda) \le (1-\varepsilon) f\Big(\frac{\lambda}{1-\varepsilon} \Big) + \frac{\lambda^2}{2\varepsilon} \frac{1}{(1-\sqrt{\theta})^2} \max_{k=0,\dots,n} \frac{C_k}{(2\theta)^k}\,;$$

(b) let $m \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ be such that $(n-m)\lambda < 1$ and $\mu \le \varepsilon \theta^{m/2}(1-\sqrt{\theta})$, where $\mu = \frac{\lambda}{1-(n-m)\lambda}$; then

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} f_+[C_0, \dots, C_n](\lambda) \le \\ \le (1-\varepsilon) f\Big(\frac{\mu}{1-\varepsilon}\Big) + \bigg(\frac{\mu^2}{2\varepsilon}\frac{1}{(1-\sqrt{\theta})^2} + \frac{\lambda}{2}\frac{\theta^{m+1}}{1-\theta}\bigg) \max_{k=0,\dots,n} \frac{C_k}{(2\theta)^k} \,.$$

The proof of Th. 1.2 uses Prop. 1.5 (whose proof uses Prop. 1.6). The relevance of (1.3)-(1.4) and 1.5 to 1.2 stems from Lemmas 1.7, 1.8. The proofs of Propositions 1.6 and 1.5 are given after Lemmas 1.9, 1.12. For the proof of Th. 1.2 see the end of this section.

1.7 Lemma. For all random variables X, Y and all $p \in (1, \infty)$,

$$p \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \frac{1}{p} X - (p-1) \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \Big(-\frac{1}{p-1} Y \Big) \le \\ \le \ln \mathbb{E} \exp(X+Y) \le \frac{1}{p} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp pX + \frac{p-1}{p} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \frac{p}{p-1} Y \,.$$

(In the lower bound we interpret $\infty - \infty$ as $-\infty$.)

Proof. By the Hölder inequality,

$$\mathbb{E} \exp(X+Y) = \mathbb{E}\,(\exp X \cdot \exp Y) \le (\mathbb{E} \exp pX)^{1/p} \Big(\mathbb{E} \exp \frac{p}{p-1} Y \Big)^{(p-1)/p} ;$$

the upper bound follows. We apply the upper bound to $\frac{1}{p}(X+Y)$ and $\big(-\frac{1}{p}Y\big)$ instead of X, Y:

$$\ln \mathbb{E} \exp \frac{1}{p} X \le \frac{1}{p} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp(X+Y) + \frac{p-1}{p} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \Big(-\frac{1}{p-1} Y \Big) ;$$

the lower bound follows. □

1.8 Lemma. (a) Let random variables X, Y and a function $f : (0, \infty) \to [0, \infty]$ be such that

$$Y \text{ is a } C\text{-duplication of } X \,, \\ \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda X \le f(\lambda) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in (0, \infty) \,.$$

Then

$$\ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda Y \le f_+[C](\lambda) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in (0, \infty) \,.$$

(b) Let random variables X, Y, Z and a function $f : (0, \infty) \to [0, \infty]$ be such that

$$\begin{gathered} X, Y \text{ are independent,} \\ \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda X \le f(\lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda Y \le f(\lambda) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in (0, \infty) , \\ \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda Z \le C\lambda^2 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in [0, 1] . \end{gathered}$$

Then

$$\ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda(X + Y + Z) \le f_+[C](\lambda) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in (0, \infty) .$$

Proof. Item (a) is a special case of Item (b). Item (b) follows from Lemma 1.7 (the upper bound) applied to $\lambda(X + Y)$ and λZ. ☐

1.9 Lemma.

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} f_+[C_0, \dots, C_n](\lambda) \le \bigl(1 - (n+1)\lambda\bigr) f\Bigl(\frac{\lambda}{1 - (n+1)\lambda}\Bigr) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{n} 2^{-k} C_k \qquad \text{for } 0 < \lambda < \frac{1}{n+1} .$$

Proof. Induction in n. For $n = 0$, the needed inequality

$$\frac{1}{2} f_+[C](\lambda) \le (1 - \lambda) f\Bigl(\frac{\lambda}{1 - \lambda}\Bigr) + \frac{\lambda}{2} C \quad \text{for } 0 < \lambda < 1 \tag{1.10}$$

follows from (1.3) for $p = \frac{1}{1-\lambda}$. For $n > 0$, denoting $f_+[C_0, \dots, C_{n-1}]$ by g, the assumed inequality for $n - 1$ takes the form

$$\frac{1}{2^n} g(\lambda) \le \bigl(1 - n\lambda\bigr) f\Bigl(\frac{\lambda}{1 - n\lambda}\Bigr) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} 2^{-k} C_k \quad \text{for } 0 < \lambda < \frac{1}{n} , \tag{1.11}$$

while the needed inequality for n becomes

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} g_+[C_n](\lambda) \le \bigl(1 - (n+1)\lambda\bigr) f\Bigl(\frac{\lambda}{1 - (n+1)\lambda}\Bigr) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{n} 2^{-k} C_k \qquad \text{for } 0 < \lambda < \frac{1}{n+1} .$$

Let $0 < \lambda < \frac{1}{n+1}$. By (1.10), $\frac{1}{2} g_+[C_n](\lambda) \le (1 - \lambda) g(\mu) + \frac{\lambda}{2} C_n$, where $\mu = \frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda}$. We note that $1 - n\mu = \frac{1-(n+1)\lambda}{1-\lambda} > 0$, $\frac{\mu}{1-n\mu} = \frac{\lambda}{1-(n+1)\lambda}$ and get from (1.11)

$$\frac{1}{2^n} g(\mu) \le \frac{1 - (n+1)\lambda}{1 - \lambda} f\Bigl(\frac{\lambda}{1 - (n+1)\lambda}\Bigr) + \frac{\mu}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} 2^{-k} C_k .$$

Thus,

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} g_+[C_n](\lambda) \le \frac{1-\lambda}{2^n} g(\mu) + \frac{\lambda}{2^{n+1}} C_n \le$$
$$\le \big(1-(n+1)\lambda\big) f\Big(\frac{\lambda}{1-(n+1)\lambda}\Big) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} 2^{-k} C_k + \frac{\lambda}{2} 2^{-n} C_n \,.$$

□

1.12 Lemma. For every $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$,

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} f_+[C_0,\dots,C_n](\lambda) \le (1-\varepsilon) f\Big(\frac{\lambda}{1-\varepsilon}\Big) + \frac{\lambda^2}{2\varepsilon}\Big(\sum_{k=0}^{n} 2^{-k/2}\sqrt{C_k}\Big)^2$$
$$\text{for } 0 < \lambda \le \varepsilon \frac{\min_{k=0,\dots,n} 2^{-k/2}\sqrt{C_k}}{\sum_{k=0,\dots,n} 2^{-k/2}\sqrt{C_k}} \,.$$

Proof. Induction in n. For $n=0$, the needed inequality

$$\frac{1}{2} f_+[C](\lambda) \le (1-\varepsilon) f\Big(\frac{\lambda}{1-\varepsilon}\Big) + \frac{\lambda^2}{2\varepsilon} C \quad \text{for } 0 < \lambda \le \varepsilon$$

follows from (1.3) for $p = \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}$. For $n > 0$, we write the assumed inequality for $n-1$ in the form

$$(1.13) \quad \frac{1}{2^n} g(\lambda_{\text{old}}) \le (1-\varepsilon_{\text{old}}) f\Big(\frac{\lambda_{\text{old}}}{1-\varepsilon_{\text{old}}}\Big) + \frac{\lambda_{\text{old}}^2}{2\varepsilon_{\text{old}}} \sigma_{\text{old}}^2$$
$$\text{whenever } 0 < \lambda_{\text{old}} \le \varepsilon_{\text{old}} \frac{m_{\text{old}}}{\sigma_{\text{old}}} \text{ and } 0 < \varepsilon_{\text{old}} < 1\,;$$

here $g = f_+[C_0,\dots,C_{n-1}]$, $\sigma_{\text{old}} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} 2^{-k/2}\sqrt{C_k}$ and $m_{\text{old}} = \min_{k=0,\dots,n-1} 2^{-k/2}\sqrt{C_k}$. We have to prove that

$$(1.14) \quad \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} g_+[C_n](\lambda) \le (1-\varepsilon) f\Big(\frac{\lambda}{1-\varepsilon}\Big) + \frac{\lambda^2}{2\varepsilon}\sigma^2$$
$$\text{whenever } 0 < \lambda \le \varepsilon \frac{m}{\sigma} \text{ and } 0 < \varepsilon < 1\,;$$

here $\sigma = \sum_{k=0}^{n} 2^{-k/2}\sqrt{C_k} = \sigma_{\text{old}} + 2^{-n/2}\sqrt{C_n}$ and $m = \min_{k=0,\dots,n} 2^{-k/2}\sqrt{C_k} = \min(m_{\text{old}}, 2^{-n/2}\sqrt{C_n})$.

By (1.3) for $p = \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}}}$,

$$g_+[C_n](\lambda) \le 2(1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}}) g\Big(\frac{\lambda}{1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}}}\Big) + \frac{C_n \lambda^2}{\varepsilon_{\text{new}}}$$
$$\text{whenever } 0 < \lambda \le \varepsilon_{\text{new}} \text{ and } 0 < \varepsilon_{\text{new}} < 1\,.$$

We combine it with (1.13) for $\lambda_{\text{old}} = \frac{\lambda}{1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}}}$:

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} g_+[C_n](\lambda) \le$$
$$(1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}})\biggl((1-\varepsilon_{\text{old}}) f\Bigl(\frac{\lambda}{(1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}})(1-\varepsilon_{\text{old}})}\Bigr) + \frac{\lambda^2}{2\varepsilon_{\text{old}}(1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}})^2}\sigma_{\text{old}}^2\biggr) + \frac{C_n \lambda^2}{2^{n+1}\varepsilon_{\text{new}}}\,.$$

In order to get (1.14) it remains to find $\varepsilon_{\text{old}}, \varepsilon_{\text{new}} \in (0,1)$ such that $(1-\varepsilon_{\text{old}})(1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}}) = 1-\varepsilon$,

$$\frac{\sigma_{\text{old}}^2}{2\varepsilon_{\text{old}}(1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}})} + \frac{C_n}{2^{n+1}\varepsilon_{\text{new}}} \le \frac{\sigma^2}{2\varepsilon} \tag{1.15}$$

and $\lambda \le \varepsilon_{\text{new}}$, $\frac{\lambda}{1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}}} \le \varepsilon_{\text{old}} \frac{m_{\text{old}}}{\sigma_{\text{old}}}$.

We define

$$x = \frac{\sigma_{\text{old}}}{2^{-n/2}\sqrt{C_n}}\,, \quad \varepsilon_{\text{old}} = \frac{\varepsilon x}{x+1-\varepsilon}\,, \quad \varepsilon_{\text{new}} = \frac{\varepsilon}{x+1}\,.$$

Clearly, $\varepsilon_{\text{old}} < 1$ (since $\varepsilon x < x < x+1-\varepsilon$) and $\varepsilon_{\text{new}} < 1$ (since $\varepsilon < 1 < x+1$). Also,

$$(1-\varepsilon_{\text{old}})(1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}}) = \frac{x+1-\varepsilon-\varepsilon x}{x+1-\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{x+1-\varepsilon}{x+1} = 1-\varepsilon\,.$$

Taking into account that $2^{-n/2}\sqrt{C_n} = \frac{\sigma_{\text{old}}}{x}$ and $\frac{\sigma_{\text{old}}}{\sigma} = \frac{x}{x+1} = \frac{(1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}})\varepsilon_{\text{old}}}{\varepsilon}$ we get

$$\lambda \le \varepsilon\frac{m}{\sigma} = \frac{\varepsilon}{\sigma}\min\Bigl(m_{\text{old}}, \frac{\sigma}{x+1}\Bigr) =$$
$$= \min\Bigl(\frac{\varepsilon m_{\text{old}}}{\sigma}, \frac{\varepsilon}{x+1}\Bigr) = \min\Bigl(m_{\text{old}} \cdot \frac{(1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}})\varepsilon_{\text{old}}}{\sigma_{\text{old}}}, \varepsilon_{\text{new}}\Bigr)\,.$$

Finally, we check (1.15):

$$\frac{\sigma_{\text{old}}^2}{2\varepsilon_{\text{old}}(1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}})} + \frac{C_n}{2^{n+1}\varepsilon_{\text{new}}} = \frac{\sigma_{\text{old}}^2}{2} \cdot \frac{x+1}{\varepsilon x} + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon_{\text{new}}}\Bigl(\frac{\sigma_{\text{old}}}{x}\Bigr)^2 =$$
$$= \frac{\sigma_{\text{old}}^2(x+1)}{2\varepsilon x} + \frac{(x+1)\sigma_{\text{old}}^2}{2\varepsilon x^2} = \frac{\sigma_{\text{old}}^2(x+1)}{2\varepsilon x^2}(x+1) =$$
$$= \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}\Bigl(\frac{\sigma_{\text{old}}(x+1)}{x}\Bigr)^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{2\varepsilon}\,.$$

□

The reader may wonder, how did I found these formulas for $\varepsilon_{\text{old}}, \varepsilon_{\text{new}}$ in the proof of Lemma 1.12. In fact, I have minimized the left-hand side of (1.15) in $\varepsilon_{\text{old}}, \varepsilon_{\text{new}}$ restricted by $(1-\varepsilon_{\text{old}})(1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}}) = 1-\varepsilon$. The expression $\bigl(\sum 2^{-k/2}\sqrt{C_k}\bigr)^2$ have appeared afterwards.

Proof of Prop. 1.6. Denote $\max_{k=0,\dots,n} \frac{C_k}{(2\theta)^k}$ by M. Without loss of generality we assume that $C_k = M(2\theta)^k$ for all k. Then

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} 2^{-k/2}\sqrt{C_k} \le \frac{\sqrt{M}}{1-\sqrt{\theta}} \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{k=0,\dots,n} 2^{-k/2}\sqrt{C_k} = \sqrt{M}\theta^{n/2} \,.$$

Item (a) follows immediately from Lemma 1.12.

Proving Item (b), we use Lemma 1.12 for passing from f to $g = f_+[C_0,\dots,C_m]$, and Lemma 1.9 for passing from g to $g_+[C_{m+1},\dots,C_n] = f_+[C_0,\dots,C_n]$. Namely,

$$\frac{1}{2^{m+1}} f_+[C_0,\dots,C_m](\mu) \le (1-\varepsilon) f\Bigl(\frac{\mu}{1-\varepsilon}\Bigr) + \frac{\mu^2}{2\varepsilon}\frac{M}{(1-\sqrt{\theta})^2}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2^{n-m}} g_+[C_{m+1},\dots,C_n](\lambda) \le \\ \le \bigl(1-(n-m)\lambda\bigr) g\Bigl(\frac{\lambda}{1-(n-m)\lambda}\Bigr) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\sum_{k=m+1}^{n} 2^{-(k-m-1)} C_k \,.$$

$\square$

Proof of Prop. 1.5. Let $\sup_n \frac{C_n}{(2\theta)^n} = M < \infty$ (otherwise there is nothing to prove). We consider two overlapping cases separately.

The first case: $\lambda \ll \theta^{n/2}$.

Prop. 1.6(a) gives eventually (when $\theta^{-n/2}\lambda$ is small enough),

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} f_+[C_0,\dots,C_n](\lambda) \le (1-\varepsilon) f\Bigl(\frac{\lambda}{1-\varepsilon}\Bigr) + \frac{\lambda^2}{2\varepsilon}\frac{M}{(1-\sqrt{\theta})^2} \,.$$

It remains to divide by λ^2 and note that

$$(1-\varepsilon)\limsup_{\lambda\to 0+} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} f\Bigl(\frac{\lambda}{1-\varepsilon}\Bigr) = \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\limsup_{\lambda\to 0+}\frac{1}{\lambda^2} f(\lambda) \,.$$

The second case: $\lambda \gg \theta^n$.

We choose $m \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ such that

$$\lambda^2 \ll \theta^m \ll \lambda \,,$$

apply Prop. 1.6(b), observe that $\mu \sim \lambda$, $\frac{\lambda}{2}\frac{\theta^{m+1}}{1-\theta} = o(\lambda^2)$ and get

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} f_+[C_0, \dots, C_n](\lambda) \le (1-\varepsilon) f\Big(\frac{\mu}{1-\varepsilon}\Big) + \bigg(\frac{\mu^2}{2\varepsilon}\frac{1}{(1-\sqrt{\theta})^2} + o\big(\lambda^2\big)\bigg) M \,.$$

It remains to divide by λ^2 and note that

$$(1-\varepsilon) \limsup \frac{1}{\lambda^2} f\Big(\frac{\mu}{1-\varepsilon}\Big) = \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \limsup_{\lambda \to 0+} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} f(\lambda) \,.$$

$\square$

We are not yet in position to prove Theorem 1.2, since the chains of inequalities considered above are based on the upper bound of Lemma 1.7. We need similar results on lower bounds.

Given $f : (0, \infty) \to [0, \infty]$ and $C \in [0, \infty)$, we define $f_-[C] : (0, \infty) \to [0, \infty]$ by

$$f_-[C](\lambda) = \sup_{p \in [\lambda+1, \infty)} 2pf\Big(\frac{\lambda}{p}\Big) - \frac{1}{p-1} C\lambda^2 \quad \text{for } \lambda \in (0, \infty) \,. \tag{1.16}$$

(The supremum is nonnegative, since the limit as $p \to \infty$ is nonnegative.) Further, we define recursively for $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

$$f_-[C_0, \dots, C_{n+1}] = (f_-[C_0, \dots, C_n])_-[C_{n+1}] \,. \tag{1.17}$$

Lemmas 1.18, 1.19, 1.22 and Propositions 1.26, 1.27 are lower-bound counterparts of 1.8, 1.9, 1.12, 1.6 and 1.5. Proofs are quite similar, but many small changes in formulas look unpredictable, especially in the proof of 1.22.

1.18 Lemma. (a) Let random variables X, Y and a function $f : (0, \infty) \to [0, \infty]$ be such that

$$Y \text{ is a } C\text{-duplication of } X \,,$$
$$\ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda X \ge f(\lambda) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in (0, \infty) \,.$$

Then

$$\ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda Y \ge f_-[C](\lambda) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in (0, \infty) \,.$$

(b) Let random variables X, Y, Z and a function $f : (0,\infty) \to [0,\infty]$ be such that

$$\begin{gathered} X, Y \text{ are independent,} \\ \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda X \ge f(\lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda Y \ge f(\lambda) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in (0,\infty)\,, \\ \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda Z \le C\lambda^2 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in [0,1]\,. \end{gathered}$$

Then

$$\ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda(X+Y-Z) \ge f_-[C](\lambda) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in (0,\infty)\,.$$

Proof. Item (a) is a special case of Item (b). Item (b) follows from Lemma 1.7 (the lower bound) applied to $\lambda(X+Y)$ and $(-\lambda Z)$. □

1.19 Lemma.

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} f_-[C_0,\dots,C_n](\lambda) \ge \big(1+(n+1)\lambda\big) f\Big(\frac{\lambda}{1+(n+1)\lambda}\Big) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{n} 2^{-k} C_k \qquad \text{for } 0 < \lambda < \infty\,.$$

Proof. Induction in n. For $n=0$, the needed inequality

$$\frac{1}{2} f_-[C](\lambda) \ge (1+\lambda) f\Big(\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}\Big) - \frac{\lambda}{2} C \quad \text{for } 0 < \lambda < \infty \tag{1.20}$$

follows from (1.16) for $p = 1+\lambda$. For $n > 0$, denoting $f_-[C_0,\dots,C_{n-1}]$ by g, the assumed inequality for $n-1$ takes the form

$$\frac{1}{2^n} g(\lambda) \ge \big(1+n\lambda\big) f\Big(\frac{\lambda}{1+n\lambda}\Big) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} 2^{-k} C_k \quad \text{for } 0 < \lambda < \infty\,, \tag{1.21}$$

while the needed inequality for n becomes

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} g_-[C_n](\lambda) \ge \big(1+(n+1)\lambda\big) f\Big(\frac{\lambda}{1+(n+1)\lambda}\Big) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{n} 2^{-k} C_k \quad \text{for } 0 < \lambda < \infty\,.$$

By (1.20), $\frac{1}{2} g_-[C_n](\lambda) \ge (1+\lambda) g(\mu) - \frac{\lambda}{2} C_n$, where $\mu = \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}$. We note that $1 + n\mu = \frac{1+(n+1)\lambda}{1+\lambda}$, $\frac{\mu}{1+n\mu} = \frac{\lambda}{1+(n+1)\lambda}$ and get from (1.21)

$$\frac{1}{2^n} g(\mu) \ge \frac{1+(n+1)\lambda}{1+\lambda} f\Big(\frac{\lambda}{1+(n+1)\lambda}\Big) - \frac{\mu}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} 2^{-k} C_k\,.$$

Thus,

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}g_-[C_n](\lambda) \ge \frac{1+\lambda}{2^n}g(\mu) - \frac{\lambda}{2^{n+1}}C_n \ge$$
$$\ge \bigl(1+(n+1)\lambda\bigr) f\Bigl(\frac{\lambda}{1+(n+1)\lambda}\Bigr) - \frac{\lambda}{2}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} 2^{-k}C_k - \frac{\lambda}{2}2^{-n}C_n\,.$$

□

1.22 Lemma. For every $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$,

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}f_-[C_0,\dots,C_n](\lambda) \ge \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}f((1-\varepsilon)\lambda) - \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2\varepsilon}\lambda^2\Bigl(\sum_{k=0}^{n} 2^{-k/2}\sqrt{C_k}\Bigr)^2$$
$$\text{for } 0<\lambda\le \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}\frac{\min_{k=0,\dots,n} 2^{-k/2}\sqrt{C_k}}{\sum_{k=0,\dots,n} 2^{-k/2}\sqrt{C_k}}\,.$$

Proof. Induction in n. For $n=0$, the needed inequality

$$\frac{1}{2}f_-[C](\lambda) \ge \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}f((1-\varepsilon)\lambda) - \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2\varepsilon}\lambda^2 C \quad \text{for } 0<\lambda\le\frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}$$

follows from (1.16) for $p=\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}$. For $n>0$, we write the assumed inequality for $n-1$ in the form

$$(1.23)\quad \frac{1}{2^n}g(\lambda_{\text{old}}) \ge \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon_{\text{old}}}f((1-\varepsilon_{\text{old}})\lambda_{\text{old}}) - \frac{1-\varepsilon_{\text{old}}}{2\varepsilon_{\text{old}}}\lambda_{\text{old}}^2\sigma_{\text{old}}^2$$
$$\text{whenever } 0<\lambda_{\text{old}}\le\frac{\varepsilon_{\text{old}}}{1-\varepsilon_{\text{old}}}\frac{m_{\text{old}}}{\sigma_{\text{old}}} \text{ and } 0<\varepsilon_{\text{old}}<1\,;$$

here $g = f_-[C_0,\dots,C_{n-1}]$, $\sigma_{\text{old}} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1}2^{-k/2}\sqrt{C_k}$ and $m_{\text{old}} = \min_{k=0,\dots,n-1}2^{-k/2}\sqrt{C_k}$. We have to prove that

$$(1.24)\quad \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}g_-[C_n](\lambda) \ge \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}f((1-\varepsilon)\lambda) - \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2\varepsilon}\lambda^2\sigma^2$$
$$\text{whenever } 0<\lambda\le\frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}\frac{m}{\sigma} \text{ and } 0<\varepsilon<1\,;$$

here $\sigma = \sum_{k=0}^{n}2^{-k/2}\sqrt{C_k} = \sigma_{\text{old}}+2^{-n/2}\sqrt{C_n}$ and $m = \min_{k=0,\dots,n}2^{-k/2}\sqrt{C_k} = \min(m_{\text{old}},2^{-n/2}\sqrt{C_n})$.

By (1.16) for $p=\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}}}$,

$$g_-[C_n](\lambda) \ge \frac{2}{1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}}}g((1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}})\lambda) - \frac{1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}}}{\varepsilon_{\text{new}}}C_n\lambda^2$$
$$\text{whenever } 0<\lambda\le\frac{\varepsilon_{\text{new}}}{1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}}} \text{ and } 0<\varepsilon_{\text{new}}<1\,.$$

We combine it with (1.23) for $\lambda_{\text{old}} = (1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}})\lambda$:

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} g_-[C_n](\lambda) \ge \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}}} \biggl(\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon_{\text{old}}} f\bigl((1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}})(1-\varepsilon_{\text{old}})\lambda \bigr) - \\ - \frac{1-\varepsilon_{\text{old}}}{2\varepsilon_{\text{old}}} (1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}})^2 \lambda^2 \sigma_{\text{old}}^2 \biggr) - \frac{1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}}}{2^{n+1}\varepsilon_{\text{new}}} C_n \lambda^2 \,.$$

In order to get (1.24) it remains to find $\varepsilon_{\text{old}}, \varepsilon_{\text{new}} \in (0,1)$ such that $(1-\varepsilon_{\text{old}})(1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}}) = 1-\varepsilon$,

$$\frac{1-\varepsilon}{2\varepsilon_{\text{old}}} \sigma_{\text{old}}^2 + \frac{1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}}}{2^{n+1}\varepsilon_{\text{new}}} C_n \le \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2\varepsilon} \sigma^2 \tag{1.25}$$

and $\lambda \le \frac{\varepsilon_{\text{new}}}{1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}}}$, $(1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}})\lambda \le \frac{\varepsilon_{\text{old}}}{1-\varepsilon_{\text{old}}} \frac{m_{\text{old}}}{\sigma_{\text{old}}}$.

We define

$$x = \frac{\sigma_{\text{old}}}{2^{-n/2}\sqrt{C_n}} \,, \quad \varepsilon_{\text{old}} = \frac{\varepsilon x}{x+1} \,, \quad \varepsilon_{\text{new}} = \frac{\varepsilon}{x+1-\varepsilon x} \,.$$

Clearly, $\varepsilon_{\text{old}} < 1$ (since $\varepsilon x < x < x+1$) and $0 < \varepsilon_{\text{new}} < 1$ (since $\varepsilon + \varepsilon x < x+1$). Also,

$$(1-\varepsilon_{\text{old}})(1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}}) = \frac{x+1-\varepsilon x}{x+1} \cdot \frac{x+1-\varepsilon x-\varepsilon}{x+1-\varepsilon x} = 1-\varepsilon \,.$$

Taking into account that $2^{-n/2}\sqrt{C_n} = \frac{\sigma_{\text{old}}}{x}$, $\frac{\sigma_{\text{old}}}{\sigma} = \frac{x}{x+1}$ and $\frac{1-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \frac{\varepsilon_{\text{new}}}{1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}}} = \frac{1}{x+1}$ we get

$$\lambda \le \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} \frac{m}{\sigma} = \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} \min\Bigl(m_{\text{old}}, \frac{\sigma_{\text{old}}}{x} \Bigr) \cdot \frac{x}{x+1} \frac{1}{\sigma_{\text{old}}} = \\ = \min\Bigl(\frac{\varepsilon x m_{\text{old}}}{(1-\varepsilon)(x+1)\sigma_{\text{old}}}, \frac{\varepsilon}{(1-\varepsilon)(x+1)} \Bigr) = \\ = \min\Bigl(\frac{\varepsilon_{\text{old}}}{(1-\varepsilon_{\text{old}})(1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}})} \frac{m_{\text{old}}}{\sigma_{\text{old}}}, \frac{\varepsilon_{\text{new}}}{1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}}} \Bigr) \,.$$

Finally, we check (1.25):

$$\frac{1-\varepsilon}{2\varepsilon_{\text{old}}} \sigma_{\text{old}}^2 + \frac{1-\varepsilon_{\text{new}}}{2\varepsilon_{\text{new}}} \cdot \frac{C_n}{2^n} = \frac{(1-\varepsilon)(x+1)}{2\varepsilon x} \sigma_{\text{old}}^2 + \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2\varepsilon} (x+1) \Bigl(\frac{\sigma_{\text{old}}}{x} \Bigr)^2 = \\ = \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2\varepsilon} \frac{x+1}{x} \sigma_{\text{old}}^2 \Bigl(1 + \frac{1}{x} \Bigr) = \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2\varepsilon} \sigma^2 \,.$$

□

1.26 Proposition. For every $\varepsilon, \theta \in (0,1)$, n and λ,

(a) if $0 < \lambda \le \varepsilon \theta^{n/2}(1-\sqrt{\theta})$ then

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} f_-[C_0,\dots,C_n](\lambda) \ge \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} f\bigl((1-\varepsilon)\lambda\bigr) - \frac{\lambda^2}{2\varepsilon} \frac{1}{(1-\sqrt{\theta})^2} \max_{k=0,\dots,n} \frac{C_k}{(2\theta)^k}\,;$$

(b) let $m \in \{0,1,\dots,n-1\}$ be such that $\mu \le \varepsilon \theta^{m/2}(1-\sqrt{\theta})$, where $\mu = \frac{\lambda}{1+(n-m)\lambda}$; then

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} f_-[C_0,\dots,C_n](\lambda) \ge$$
$$\ge \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} f\bigl((1-\varepsilon)\mu\bigr) - \biggl(\frac{\mu^2}{2\varepsilon} \frac{1}{(1-\sqrt{\theta})^2} + \frac{\lambda}{2} \frac{\theta^{m+1}}{1-\theta} \biggr) \max_{k=0,\dots,n} \frac{C_k}{(2\theta)^k}\,.$$

Proof. Denote $\max_{k=0,\dots,n} \frac{C_k}{(2\theta)^k}$ by M. Without loss of generality we assume that $C_k = M(2\theta)^k$ for all k. Then

$$\sum_{k=0}^n 2^{-k/2}\sqrt{C_k} \le \frac{\sqrt{M}}{1-\sqrt{\theta}} \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{k=0,\dots,n} 2^{-k/2}\sqrt{C_k} = \sqrt{M}\theta^{n/2}\,.$$

Item (a) follows immediately from Lemma 1.22.

Proving Item (b), we use Lemma 1.22 for passing from f to $g = f_-[C_0,\dots,C_m]$, and Lemma 1.19 for passing from g to $g_-[C_{m+1},\dots,C_n] = f_-[C_0,\dots,C_n]$. Namely,

$$\frac{1}{2^{m+1}} f_-[C_0,\dots,C_m](\mu) \ge \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} f\bigl((1-\varepsilon)\mu\bigr) - \frac{\mu^2}{2\varepsilon} \frac{M}{(1-\sqrt{\theta})^2}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2^{n-m}} g_-[C_{m+1},\dots,C_n](\lambda) \ge$$
$$\ge \bigl(1+(n-m)\lambda\bigr) g\Bigl(\frac{\lambda}{1+(n-m)\lambda}\Bigr) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{k=m+1}^n 2^{-(k-m-1)} C_k\,.$$

$\square$

1.27 Proposition. For every $\varepsilon, \theta \in (0,1)$,

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty, \lambda n \to 0+} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}\lambda^2} f_-[C_0,\dots,C_n](\lambda) \ge$$
$$\ge (1-\varepsilon) \liminf_{\lambda\to 0+} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} f(\lambda) - \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2\varepsilon(1-\sqrt{\theta})^2} \sup_n \frac{C_n}{(2\theta)^n}\,.$$

Proof. Let $\sup_n \frac{C_n}{(2\theta)^n} = M < \infty$ (otherwise there is nothing to prove). We consider two overlapping cases separately.

The first case: $\lambda \ll \theta^{n/2}$.

Prop. 1.26(a) gives eventually (when $\theta^{-n/2}\lambda$ is small enough),

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} f_-[C_0, \dots, C_n](\lambda) \ge \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} f\big((1-\varepsilon)\lambda\big) - \frac{\lambda^2}{2\varepsilon} \frac{M}{(1-\sqrt{\theta})^2} \, .$$

It remains to divide by λ^2 and note that

$$\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \liminf_{\lambda \to 0+} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} f\big((1-\varepsilon)\lambda\big) = (1-\varepsilon) \liminf_{\lambda \to 0+} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} f(\lambda) \, .$$

The second case: $\lambda \gg \theta^n$.

We choose $m \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ such that

$$\lambda^2 \ll \theta^m \ll \lambda \, ,$$

apply Prop. 1.26(b), observe that $\mu \sim \lambda$, $\frac{\lambda}{2} \frac{\theta^{m+1}}{1-\theta} = o(\lambda^2)$ and get

$$\frac{1}{2^{n+1}} f_-[C_0, \dots, C_n](\lambda) \ge \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} f\big((1-\varepsilon)\mu\big) - \bigg(\frac{\mu^2}{2\varepsilon} \frac{1}{(1-\sqrt{\theta})^2} + o\big(\lambda^2\big) \bigg) M \, .$$

It remains to divide by λ^2 and note that

$$\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \liminf \frac{1}{\lambda^2} f\big((1-\varepsilon)\mu\big) = (1-\varepsilon) \liminf_{\lambda \to 0+} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} f(\lambda) \, .$$

□

Now we combine lower and upper bounds. (See also 5.13 for a more general statement.)

1.28 Proposition. Let numbers $C_1, C_2, \dots$ satisfy $\sup_n \big((2\theta)^{-n} C_n \big) < \infty$ for some $\theta < 1$, and functions $f_1, f_2, \dots : (0, \infty) \to [0, \infty]$ satisfy $(f_n)_-[C_n] \le f_{n+1} \le (f_n)_+[C_n]$ for all n. Assume existence of the limit $\lim_{\lambda \to 0+} \big(\lambda^{-2} f_n(\lambda) \big) \in [0, \infty)$ for every n. Then the following limit exists:

$$\lim_{n \to \infty, \lambda n \to 0+} \frac{f_n(\lambda)}{2^n \lambda^2} \in [0, \infty) \, .$$

Proof. By Prop. 1.5, for every m and ε,

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty, \lambda n \to 0+} \frac{1}{2^{n-m} \lambda^2} (f_m)_+[C_{m+1}, \dots, C_n](\lambda) \le$$

$$\le \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \lim_{\lambda \to 0+} \frac{f_m(\lambda)}{\lambda^2} + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon (1-\sqrt{\theta})^2} \sup_{n > m} \frac{C_n}{(2\theta)^{n-m-1}} \, .$$

Therefore

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty,\lambda n\to 0+} \frac{f_n(\lambda)}{2^n\lambda^2} \le \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \lim_{\lambda\to 0+} \frac{f_m(\lambda)}{2^m\lambda^2} + \frac{\theta^{m+1}}{4\varepsilon(1-\sqrt{\theta})^2} \sup_n \frac{C_n}{(2\theta)^n} < \infty\,.$$

The last term vanishes as $m\to\infty$;

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty,\lambda n\to 0+} \frac{f_n(\lambda)}{2^n\lambda^2} \le \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \liminf_{m\to\infty} \lim_{\lambda\to 0+} \frac{f_m(\lambda)}{2^m\lambda^2}\,.$$

Now the factor $1/(1-\varepsilon)$ may be dropped.

The same argument applies to lower bounds (using Prop. 1.27);

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty,\lambda n\to 0+} \frac{f_n(\lambda)}{2^n\lambda^2} \ge \limsup_{m\to\infty} \lim_{\lambda\to 0+} \frac{f_m(\lambda)}{2^m\lambda^2}\,.$$

It follows that these four numbers are equal. ☐

1.29 Lemma. If $\mathbb{E}\,X=0$ then $\mathbb{E}\,\exp\lambda X\ge 1$ for all $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$.

Proof. $\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{e}^{\lambda X}-1=\mathbb{E}\left(\mathrm{e}^{\lambda X}-1-\lambda X\right)\ge 0$. ☐

1.30 Lemma. If Y is a C-duplication of X and $\mathbb{E}\,\exp\varepsilon|X|<\infty$ for some $\varepsilon>0$, then $\mathbb{E}\,\exp\delta|Y|<\infty$ for some $\delta>0$, and $\mathbb{E}\,Y=2\,\mathbb{E}\,X$.

Proof. We use 1.8(a) and note that $f(\varepsilon)<\infty$ implies $f_+[C]\big(\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}\big)<\infty$ (see (1.10)), therefore $\mathbb{E}\,\exp\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}Y<\infty$. The same holds for $(-X),(-Y)$, thus $\mathbb{E}\,\exp\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}|Y|<\infty$. For Z of Def. 1.1 we have $\mathbb{E}\,Z=\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}\big|_{\lambda=0}\ln\mathbb{E}\,\exp\lambda Z=0$, therefore $\mathbb{E}\,Y=2\,\mathbb{E}\,X$. ☐

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By induction, using Lemma 1.30, $\mathbb{E}\,\exp\varepsilon_n|X_n|<\infty$ for some $\varepsilon_n>0$, and $\mathbb{E}\,X_n=0$. By Lemma 1.29, $\mathbb{E}\,\exp\lambda X_n\ge 1$ for all λ. By 1.8(a) and 1.18(a), the functions

$$f_n(\lambda)=\ln\mathbb{E}\,\exp\lambda X_n$$

satisfy $(f_n)_-[C]\le f_{n+1}\le(f_n)_+[C]$. Prop. 1.28 ensures existence of the limit

$$\lim_{n\to\infty,\lambda n\to 0+} \frac{f_n(\lambda)}{2^n\lambda^2}\,.$$

The same argument applied to $(-X_n)$ gives us $\lim_{n\to\infty,\lambda n\to 0-}\frac{f_n(\lambda)}{2^n\lambda^2}$. The two limits are equal, since both are equal to $\lim_{n\to\infty}\big(2^{-n-1}f_n''(0)\big)$. ☐

2 Splittable random processes

Theorem 2, Corollary 3 and Corollary 4, formulated in the introduction, are proved in this section. Theorem 2.16 is used (and generalized) in Sect. 5 (see 5.6), and Lemma 2.3 is used in Sections 3, 5. Many arguments of this section (especially, proofs of 2.10–2.15) are reused in Sect. 5 (especially, 5.14–5.19).

Splittability is defined in the introduction (see Def. 1) for stationary random processes. The reader may restrict himself to random processes with continuous sample functions, but in full generality, a random process is treated in this work as a measurable map $X : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ (given a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$). Two such maps $X_1, X_2 : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$P\big(\{\omega : X_1(t,\omega) = X_2(t,\omega)\}\big) = 1 \quad \text{for every } t \in \mathbb{R}\,, \tag{2.1}$$

are the same for all purposes of this work. (Accordingly, we may treat a random process as an equivalence class.) Every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ leads to a random variable $X_t : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, $X_t(\omega) = X(t,\omega)$, treated as an equivalence class. Sample paths $t \mapsto X(t,\omega)$ are defined for almost all ω, but only as equivalence classes; their (dis-)continuity is irrelevant.

Here is some background (mostly for non-probabilists).

Condition (2.1) ensures that $\int_0^1 |X_1(t,\omega)| \, \mathrm{d}t = \int_0^1 |X_2(t,\omega)| \, \mathrm{d}t$ for almost all ω. Thus, the random variable $\int_0^1 |X_t| \, \mathrm{d}t$ is well-defined as an equivalence class of functions $\Omega \to [0,\infty]$.

Two processes $X : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_1 \to \mathbb{R}$, $Y : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_2 \to \mathbb{R}$ are called *identically distributed,* if for all n and $t_1, \dots, t_n \in \mathbb{R}$ the random vectors $(X_{t_1}, \dots, X_{t_n})$ and $(Y_{t_1}, \dots, Y_{t_n})$ are identically distributed. It follows that the random variables $\int_0^1 |X_t| \, \mathrm{d}t$ and $\int_0^1 |Y_t| \, \mathrm{d}t$ are identically distributed.

The same holds for many other integrals, of course. Some of them are mentioned in Def. 1, Th. 2 and the corollaries.

A process X is called *stationary,* if for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$ the shifted process $(t,\omega) \mapsto X(s+t,\omega)$ is distributed like X.

Two processes $X, Y : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ are called *independent,* if for all n and $t_1, \dots, t_n \in \mathbb{R}$ the random vectors $(X_{t_1}, \dots, X_{t_n})$ and $(Y_{t_1}, \dots, Y_{t_n})$ are independent.

If X is stationary then the distribution of $\int_s^{s+1} |X_t| \, \mathrm{d}t$ does not depend on s. If X and Y are independent then the random variables $\int_0^1 |X_t| \, \mathrm{d}t$ and $\int_0^1 |Y_t| \, \mathrm{d}t$ are independent.

By the Fubini theorem, $\mathbb{E} \int_0^1 |X_t| \, \mathrm{d}t = \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \, |X_t| \, \mathrm{d}t \in [0,\infty]$, and if this value is finite then $\int_0^1 X_t \, \mathrm{d}t$ is a well-defined random variable $\Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, and $\mathbb{E} \int_0^1 X_t \, \mathrm{d}t = \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \, X_t \, \mathrm{d}t$.

We will return to random processes after two quite general lemmas about random variables.

2.2 Lemma. For every random variable X and numbers $C \in [0, \infty)$, $\lambda \in [-1, 1]$,

$$\text{if } \mathbb{E} \cosh X \le \cosh C \quad \text{then} \quad \mathbb{E} \cosh \lambda X \le \cosh \lambda C \, .$$

Proof. It is sufficient to find a number $u > 0$ such that

$$\cosh \lambda X - \cosh \lambda C \le u (\cosh X - \cosh C) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

which boils down to the inequality

$$\cosh \lambda x - \cosh \lambda y \le \frac{\lambda \sinh \lambda y}{\sinh y} (\cosh x - \cosh y)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $y \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\lambda \in [-1, 1]$. In terms of the continuous function $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, y) &= \frac{\cosh \lambda x - \cosh \lambda y}{\cosh x - \cosh y} \quad \text{for } x \ne y \, , \\ f(x, x) &= \frac{\lambda \sinh \lambda x}{\sinh x} \quad \text{for } x \ne 0 \, , \quad f(0, 0) = \lambda^2 \, , \end{aligned}$$

the needed inequality becomes

$$f(y, y) \le f(x, y) = f(y, x) \le f(x, x) \quad \text{whenever } 0 < x < y \, .$$

In order to prove the latter we note that $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x} f(x, x) \le 0$ for $x > 0$ (since $\lambda \tanh x \le \tanh \lambda x$), and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(x, y) = - \frac{\sinh x}{\cosh x - \cosh y} \big(f(x, y) - f(x, x) \big) \, .$$

The function $g(x) = f(x, y) - f(x, x)$ satisfies $g(y) = 0$ and

$$g(x) > 0 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad g'(x) > 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in (0, y) \, ,$$

which shows that $g(x) \le 0$ for all $x \in (0, y)$. Similarly,

$$g(x) < 0 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad g'(x) > 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in (y, \infty) \, ,$$

which shows that $g(x) \ge 0$ for all $x \in (y, \infty)$. $\square$

2.3 Lemma. For every random variable X and numbers $C \in [0,\infty)$, $\lambda \in [-1,1]$,

$$\text{if } \mathbb{E}\,\exp|X| \le \cosh C \text{ and } \mathbb{E}\,X = 0 \quad\text{then}\qquad \mathbb{E}\,\exp\lambda X \le \exp(AC^2\lambda^2)$$

where $A \in (0,\infty)$ is an absolute constant.

Proof. We take

$$A = \sup_{x\in(0,\infty)} \frac{\ln(2\cosh x - 1)}{x^2}\,;$$

the supremum is finite, since the fraction tends to 1 as $x \to 0+$ and to 0 as $x \to \infty$. Using Lemma 2.2 and taking into account that $\cosh X \le \exp|X|$ we get

$$2\,\mathbb{E}\,\cosh\lambda X \le 2\cosh\lambda C \le 1 + \exp(A(\lambda C)^2)\,.$$

On the other hand, $\mathbb{E}\,\exp(-\lambda X) \ge 1$ by Lemma 1.29. Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}\,\exp\lambda X = 2\,\mathbb{E}\,\cosh\lambda X - \mathbb{E}\,\exp(-\lambda X) \le 2\,\mathbb{E}\,\cosh\lambda X - 1 \le \exp(AC^2\lambda^2)\,.$$

□

2.4 Remark. Lemma 2.3 is a uniform version of equivalence between the following two conditions on a random variable X:

(a) there exists $C < \infty$ such that $\ln\mathbb{E}\,\exp\lambda X \le C\lambda^2$ for all $\lambda \in [-1,1]$;

(b) $\mathbb{E}\,\exp|X| < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}\,X = 0$.

This equivalence is easy to prove without Lemma 2.2, as follows.

(a) $\Longrightarrow$ (b): $\mathbb{E}\,\exp|X| \le \mathbb{E}\,(\mathrm{e}^X + \mathrm{e}^{-X}) \le 2\mathrm{e}^C < \infty$; and $\mathbb{E}\,X = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}\big|_{\lambda=0}\ln\mathbb{E}\,\exp\lambda X = 0$.

(b) $\Longrightarrow$ (a): the function $\lambda \mapsto \lambda^{-2}\ln\mathbb{E}\,\exp\lambda X$ is continuous on $[-1,0)\cup(0,1]$ and has a finite limit at 0, therefore it is bounded.

We return to random processes.

2.5 Lemma.

$$\mathbb{E}\,\exp\frac{\lambda}{r}\left|\int_0^r X_t\,\mathrm{d}t\right| \le \frac{1}{r}\int_0^r \mathbb{E}\,\exp\lambda|X_t|\,\mathrm{d}t\,.$$

Proof. By convexity of the function $x \mapsto \mathrm{e}^{\lambda x}$,

$$\exp\left(\lambda\frac{1}{r}\int_0^r |X_t|\,\mathrm{d}t\right) \le \frac{1}{r}\int_0^r \exp\lambda|X_t|\,\mathrm{d}t\,;$$

we take the expectation. □

Here are the main steps toward Theorem 2. Using Th. 1.2 we get the convergence for $f(\cdot) = 1$ and $r \in \{1, 2, 4, 8, \dots\}$ (Prop. 2.10), then tor all r (Prop. 2.13). By 'concatenation' (Lemma 2.14) we treat step functions f. Continuous f are reached by a limiting procedure (Lemma 2.17) based on an upper bound (Th. 2.16) that holds for all bounded measurable f; its proof uses Prop. 1.5.

According to Def. 1, all splittable processes are stationary in this section (but not in Sect. 5, see Def. 5.5).

2.6 Lemma. Let X be splittable. Then there exists $C < \infty$ such that

(a) for every $r \in (0, \infty)$, the random variable $\int_0^{2r} X_t \, \mathrm{d}t$ is a C-duplication of the random variable $\int_0^r X_t \, \mathrm{d}t$;

(b) for every $s, r \in (0, \infty)$ and every measurable $f : (-s, r) \to [-1, 1]$ there exist (on some probability space) random variables Y_-, Y_+ and Z such that

Y_-, Y_+ are independent;
Y_- is distributed like $\int_{-s}^0 f(t) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t$;
Y_+ is distributed like $\int_0^r f(t) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t$;
$Y_- + Y_+ + Z$ is distributed like $\int_{-s}^r f(t) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t$;
$\ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda Z \le C\lambda^2$ for all $\lambda \in [-1, 1]$.

(c) for s, r and f as in (b) and $\lambda \in [-1, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} (2.7) \quad \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_{-s}^r f(t) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t \le \frac{1}{p} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp p\lambda \int_{-s}^0 f(t) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t + \\ + \frac{1}{p} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp p\lambda \int_0^r f(t) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t + \frac{p}{p-1} C\lambda^2 \quad \text{for } p \in \Big[\frac{1}{1-\lambda}, \infty \Big) ; \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (2.8) \quad \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_{-s}^r f(t) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t \ge p \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \frac{\lambda}{p} \int_{-s}^0 f(t) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t + \\ + p \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \frac{\lambda}{p} \int_0^r f(t) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t - \frac{1}{p-1} C\lambda^2 \quad \text{for } p \in [1 + \lambda, \infty) . \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Item (a) is a special case of (b). Item (c) follows from (b) by 1.8(b) and 1.18(b) applied twice: to Y_-, Y_+, Z and $(-Y_-), (-Y_+), (-Z)$. In order to prove Item (b) we take X^0, X^-, X^+ as in Def. 1. Random variables $Y_- = \int_{-s}^0 f(t) X_t^- \, \mathrm{d}t$ and $Y_+ = \int_0^r f(t) X_t^+ \, \mathrm{d}t$ are independent and distributed like $\int_{-s}^0 f(t) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t$ and $\int_0^r f(t) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t$ respectively. We define $Z = \int_{-s}^r f(t) X_t^0 \, \mathrm{d}t - Y_- - Y_+$, then the random variable $Y_- + Y_+ + Z$ is distributed like $\int_{-s}^r f(t) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t$. It remains to ensure that $\ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda Z \le C\lambda^2$ for $\lambda \in [-1, 1]$.

We have $\mathbb{E}\,\exp|Z| \le \mathbb{E}\,\exp\bigl(\int_{-s}^0 |f(t)||X_t^0 - X_t^-|\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^r |f(t)||X_t^0 - X_t^+|\,\mathrm{d}t\bigr) \le B$, where $B = \mathbb{E}\,\exp\bigl(\int_{-\infty}^0 |X_t^0 - X_t^-|\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^\infty |X_t^0 - X_t^+|\,\mathrm{d}t\bigr)$. Also, $\mathbb{E}\,Z = 0$ (the use of Fubini theorem is justified by finiteness of B). By Lemma 2.3, $\ln \mathbb{E}\,\exp \lambda Z \le AM^2\lambda^2$ if M is defined by $\cosh M = B$. ☐

2.9 Remark. The constant C in 2.6 depends only on the expectation in Def. 1(c).

2.10 Proposition. If a process X is splittable then for every $r \in (0,\infty)$ the following limit exists:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty,\lambda n\to 0} \frac{1}{2^n\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E}\,\exp \lambda \int_0^{2^n r} X_t\,\mathrm{d}t\,.$$

Proof. Random variables $X_n = \int_0^{2^n r} X_t\,\mathrm{d}t$ satisfy Conditions (a)–(d) of Theorem 1.2. Indeed, Lemma 2.6(a) verifies (a) for $C_n = C$; (b) and (d) are evident; (c) follows from Lemma 2.5. ☐

2.11 Lemma. Let X be splittable. Then there exists $\sigma \in [0,\infty)$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty,\lambda n\to 0} \frac{1}{2^n\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E}\,\exp \lambda \int_0^{2^n r} X_t\,\mathrm{d}t = \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 r \quad \text{for all } r \in (0,\infty)\,.$$

Proof. For each r the limit exists by Prop. 2.10. Denote the limit by $\varphi(r)$. Applying Lemma 2.6(c) to $2^n s, 2^n r$ (and $f(\cdot) = 1$), dividing (2.7), (2.8) by $2^n\lambda^2$ and taking the limit we get

$$\frac{1}{p}\bigl(\varphi(s) + \varphi(r)\bigr) \le \varphi(s+r) \le p\bigl(\varphi(s) + \varphi(r)\bigr)$$

for all $p > 1$; thus, $\varphi(s+r) = \varphi(s) + \varphi(r)$ for all $s, r > 0$. Being measurable, such φ must be linear. Finally, $\varphi(r) \ge 0$, since $\mathbb{E}\,\exp \lambda \int_0^r X_t\,\mathrm{d}t \ge 1$ by Lemma 1.29. ☐

2.12 Lemma. The convergence in Lemma 2.11 is uniform in $r \in (0, M)$ for every $M > 0$.

Proof. Denoting

$$f_n(\lambda, r) = \frac{1}{2^n\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E}\,\exp \lambda \int_0^{2^n r} X_t\,\mathrm{d}t - 0.5\sigma^2 r\,,$$

we have (for every t) $f_n(\lambda, r) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, $\lambda n \to 0$. By (2.7),

$$2^n\lambda^2\bigl(f_n(\lambda, s+r) + 0.5\sigma^2(s+r)\bigr) \le \frac{1}{p}2^n(p\lambda)^2\bigl(f_n(p\lambda, s) + 0.5\sigma^2 s\bigr) + \\ + \frac{1}{p}2^n(p\lambda)^2\bigl(f_n(p\lambda, r) + 0.5\sigma^2 r\bigr) + \frac{p}{p-1}C\lambda^2$$

provided that $(1-\lambda)p \ge 1$. Thus,

$$f_n(\lambda, s+r) \le p f_n(p\lambda, s) + p f_n(p\lambda, r) + (p-1)\cdot 0.5\sigma^2(s+r) + 2^{-n}\frac{p}{p-1}C\,.$$

By (2.8),

$$\begin{aligned}2^n\lambda^2\bigl(f_n(\lambda, s+r) + 0.5\sigma^2(s+r)\bigr) \ge p2^n\Bigl(\frac{\lambda}{p}\Bigr)^2\Bigl(f_n\Bigl(\frac{\lambda}{p}, s\Bigr) + 0.5\sigma^2 s\Bigr) + \\ + p2^n\Bigl(\frac{\lambda}{p}\Bigr)^2\Bigl(f_n\Bigl(\frac{\lambda}{p}, r\Bigr) + 0.5\sigma^2 r\Bigr) - \frac{1}{p-1}C\lambda^2\end{aligned}$$

provided that $p - \lambda \ge 1$. Thus,

$$f_n(\lambda, s+r) \ge \frac{1}{p} f_n\Bigl(\frac{\lambda}{p}, r\Bigr) + \frac{1}{p} f_n\Bigl(\frac{\lambda}{p}, r\Bigr) - \frac{p-1}{p}\cdot 0.5\sigma^2(s+r) - 2^{-n}\frac{1}{p-1}C\,.$$

Given $\varepsilon > 0$, we take N and $\delta > 0$ such that $|f_n(\lambda, r)| \le \varepsilon$ whenever $n \ge N$, $n|\lambda| \le \delta$ and $r \in A$ for some measurable set $A \subset (0, 2M)$ of Lebesgue measure $> \frac{3}{2}M$. Increasing N if needed, we guarantee that $\frac{\delta}{N} \le \frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{C}{2^N\varepsilon} \le \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\Bigl(1 - \frac{\delta}{N}\Bigr)\Bigl(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\sigma^2 M}\Bigr) \ge 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \Bigl(1 - \frac{C}{2^N\varepsilon}\Bigr)\Bigl(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\sigma^2 M}\Bigr) \ge 1\,.$$

We take p such that

$$\Bigl(1 - \frac{\delta}{N}\Bigr)p \ge 1\,, \quad \Bigl(1 - \frac{C}{2^N\varepsilon}\Bigr)p \ge 1\,, \quad p \le 1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\sigma^2 M}\,, \quad p \le 2\,.$$

Then for $s, r \in (0, M)$ (and $n \ge N$, $n|\lambda| \le \delta$) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{p} f_n\Bigl(\frac{\lambda}{p}, s\Bigr) + \frac{1}{p} f_n\Bigl(\frac{\lambda}{p}, r\Bigr) - 2\varepsilon \le f_n(\lambda, s+r) \le \\ \le p f_n(p\lambda, s) + p f_n(p\lambda, r) + 2\varepsilon\,.\end{aligned}$$

Assuming in addition that $pn|\lambda| \le \delta$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{p} f_n\Bigl(\frac{\lambda}{p}, s+r\Bigr) - f_n(\lambda, s) - \frac{2\varepsilon}{p} \le f_n(\lambda, r) \le \\ \le p f_n(p\lambda, s+r) - f_n(\lambda, s) + 2p\varepsilon\,.\end{aligned}$$

If $s, s+r \in A$ then $|f_n(p\lambda, s+r)| \le \varepsilon$, $|f_n\bigl(\frac{\lambda}{p}, s+r\bigr)| \le \varepsilon$, $|f_n(\lambda, s)| \le \varepsilon$, therefore $|f_n(\lambda, r)| \le 7\varepsilon$. It remains to note that for every $r \in (0, M)$ there exists $s \in A$ such that $s + r \in A$. $\square$

2.13 Proposition. Let X be splittable. Then there exists $\sigma \in [0,\infty)$ such that

$$\lim_{r\to\infty,\lambda\log r\to 0} \frac{1}{r\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_0^r X_t \,\mathrm{d}t = \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 \,.$$

Proof. By lemma 2.12, for every ε there exist N and δ such that

$$\left| \frac{1}{2^n\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_0^{2^n r} X_t \,\mathrm{d}t - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 r \right| \le \varepsilon$$

whenever $n \ge N$, $n|\lambda| \le \delta$, $1 \le r \le 2$. Dividing by r and letting $2^n r = s$ we get

$$\left| \frac{1}{s\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_0^{s} X_t \,\mathrm{d}t - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 \right| \le \varepsilon$$

whenever $s \ge 2^N$ and $|\lambda| \log_2 s \le \delta$. ☐

2.14 Lemma. Let X be splittable, $u, v, a, b \in [0,\infty)$, and $f : (-u, v) \to [-1,1]$ a measurable function. Then existence of two limits

$$\lim_{r\to\infty,\lambda\log r\to 0} \frac{1}{r\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_{-ur}^0 f\Big(\frac{t}{r}\Big) X_t \,\mathrm{d}t = a \,,$$

$$\lim_{r\to\infty,\lambda\log r\to 0} \frac{1}{r\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_0^{vr} f\Big(\frac{t}{r}\Big) X_t \,\mathrm{d}t = b$$

implies existence of the following limit, and the equality

$$\lim_{r\to\infty,\lambda\log r\to 0} \frac{1}{r\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_{-ur}^{vr} f\Big(\frac{t}{r}\Big) X_t \,\mathrm{d}t = a + b \,.$$

Proof. Applying Lemma 2.6(c) to ur, vr (and $f(\cdot/r)$), dividing (2.7), (2.8) by $r\lambda^2$ and taking the limit we get (similarly to the proof of Lemma 2.11)

$$\frac{1}{p}(a+b) \le \liminf_{r\to\infty,\lambda\log r\to 0} \frac{1}{r\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_{-ur}^{vr} f\Big(\frac{t}{r}\Big) X_t \,\mathrm{d}t \le \limsup(\dots) \le p(a+b)$$

for all $p > 1$. ☐

2.15 Lemma. Let X be splittable. Then there exists $\sigma \in [0,\infty)$ such that

$$\lim_{r\to\infty,\lambda\log r\to 0} \frac{1}{r\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f\Big(\frac{t}{r}\Big) X_t \,\mathrm{d}t = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \|f\|^2_{L_2(\mathbb{R})}$$

for every step function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ (that is, a *finite* linear combination of indicators of *bounded* intervals).

Proof. Induction in the number n of 'steps' of f. For $n = 1$ (a single interval) it follows from Prop. 2.13. The transition to $n+1$ is ensured by the 'concatenation' Lemma 2.14. $\square$

2.16 Theorem. For every splittable process X there exist $R \in (1,\infty)$, $\delta > 0$ and $M < \infty$ such that

$$\frac{1}{r\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_0^r f(t) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t \le M$$

for all $r \in [R,\infty)$, $\lambda \in [-\frac{\delta}{\ln r}, 0) \cup (0, \frac{\delta}{\ln r}]$ and all measurable functions $f : \mathbb{R} \to [-1,1]$.

Proof. Let $\lambda > 0$ (otherwise we turn to $(-f)$). For every $s \in (0,1]$ Lemma 2.5 gives $\mathbb{E} \exp | \int_0^s f(t) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t | \le \mathbb{E} \exp |X_0| < \infty$. Lemma 2.3 gives a constant C_1 such that $\mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_0^s f(t) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t \le \exp(C_1 \lambda^2)$ for $|\lambda| \le 1$. Lemma 2.6 gives us another constant, denote it by C_2. (Note that C_1, C_2 do not depend on f.)

Defining functions $\alpha_n : (0,\infty) \to [0,\infty]$ by

$$\alpha_0(\lambda) = \begin{cases} C_1 \lambda^2 & \text{for } \lambda \in (0,1], \\ \infty & \text{for } \lambda \in (1,\infty), \end{cases}$$
$$\alpha_{n+1} = (\alpha_n)_+[C_2] \quad \text{for } n = 0, 1, \dots$$

we have for $s \in (0,1]$

$$\ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_0^{2^n s} f(t) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t \le \alpha_n(\lambda) \quad \text{for } \lambda \in (0,\infty)$$

for $n = 0$, and by induction, for all n; the transition from n to $n+1$ is based on (2.7).

By Prop. 1.5,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty, \lambda n \to 0+} \frac{1}{2^n \lambda^2} \alpha_n(\lambda) < \infty \, ,$$

which gives us N, δ and C such that $\frac{1}{2^n \lambda^2} \alpha_n(\lambda) \le C$ whenever $n \ge N$, $\lambda n \le \delta$. We have

$$\frac{1}{2^n s \lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_0^{2^n s} f(t) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t \le \frac{C}{s} \le 2C$$

for $s \in [\frac12, 1]$. Therefore

$$\frac{1}{r\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_0^r f(t) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t \le 2C$$

whenever $r \ge 2^{N-1}$ and $\lambda \log_2(2r) \le \delta$. $\square$

2.17 Lemma. Let X be splittable, and σ as in Lemma 2.15. Then the set of all $f \in L_\infty(0,1)$ such that

$$\lim_{r\to\infty, \lambda \log r \to 0} \frac{1}{r\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_0^r f\Big(\frac{t}{r}\Big) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \|f\|^2_{L_2(0,1)}$$

is closed.

Proof. Let g belong to this set, $f \in L_\infty(0,1)$ and $\|f-g\| \le \varepsilon < 1$. We consider random variables

$$X = \lambda \int_0^r g\Big(\frac{t}{r}\Big) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t \,, \quad Y = \lambda \int_0^r (f-g)\Big(\frac{t}{r}\Big) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t \,.$$

Theorem 2.16 gives us M such that

$$\frac{1}{r\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda Y = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r(\varepsilon\lambda)^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \varepsilon\lambda \cdot \frac{Y}{\varepsilon} \le M\varepsilon^2$$

provided that r is large enough and $|\lambda| \log r$ is small enough. We apply Lemma 1.7 to X, Y, divide by $r\lambda^2$ and take the limit:

$$\begin{aligned} p\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\Big\|\frac{1}{p}g\Big\|^2 - (p-1)M\Big(\frac{\varepsilon}{p-1}\Big)^2 \le \\ \le \liminf_{r\to\infty, \lambda\log r\to 0} \frac{1}{r\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_0^r f\Big(\frac{t}{r}\Big) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t \le \limsup(\dots) \le \\ \le \frac{1}{p}\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\|pg\|^2 + \frac{p-1}{p} M \Big(\frac{p}{p-1}\varepsilon\Big)^2 \end{aligned}$$

for all $p \in (1,\infty)$. We choose $p = \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}$, then

$$(1-\varepsilon)\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\|g\|^2 - \varepsilon(1-\varepsilon)M \le \liminf(\dots) \le \limsup(\dots) \le \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\|g\|^2 + \varepsilon M \,.$$

Also, $\|f-g\|_{L_2(0,1)} \le \varepsilon$. Having such g for every ε we get $\liminf(\dots) = \limsup(\dots) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\|f\|^2$. □

Proof of Theorem 2. If f vanishes outside $(0,1)$, the claim follows immediately from Lemmas 2.15, 2.17. In general we take C such that f vanishes outside $(-C, C)$ and define g by $g(t) = f(-C+2Ct)$, then g vanishes outside $(0,1)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{r\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int f\Big(\frac{t}{r}\Big) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t = \\ = 2C \cdot \frac{1}{2Cr\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int g\Big(\frac{t}{2Cr}\Big) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t \to 2C \cdot \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\|g\|^2_{L_2(0,1)} = \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\|f\|^2_{L_2(\mathbb{R})} \,. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Corollary 3. Let $r_n \to \infty$, $c_n \to \infty$, $(c_n \log r_n)^2/r_n \to 0$; we have to prove that

$$\frac{1}{c_n^2} \ln \mathbb{P}\biggl(\int f\Bigl(\frac{t}{r_n}\Bigr) X_t \,\mathrm{d}t \ge c_n \sigma \|f\| \sqrt{r_n} \biggr) \to -\frac{1}{2} \quad \text{as } n \to \infty \,.$$

By Theorem 2,

$$\frac{1}{c_n^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \frac{\lambda c_n}{\sqrt{r_n}} \int f\Bigl(\frac{t}{r_n}\Bigr) X_t \,\mathrm{d}t \to \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \|f\|^2 \lambda^2 \quad \text{as } n \to \infty$$

for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. By the Gärtner-Ellis theorem [5] (with the scale c_n and speed c_n^2), random variables $\frac{1}{\sqrt{r_n} c_n} \int f\bigl(\frac{t}{r_n}\bigr) X_t \,\mathrm{d}t$ satisfy MDP with the rate function $x \mapsto \frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2 \|f\|^2}$. ☐

Proof of Corollary 4. For every $\lambda \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (0, \infty)$, by Th. 2,

$$\frac{1}{r(\lambda/\sqrt{r})^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{r}} \int f\Bigl(\frac{t}{r}\Bigr) X_t \,\mathrm{d}t \to \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \|f\|^2 \quad \text{as } t \to \infty \,,$$

that is,

$$\mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} \int f\Bigl(\frac{t}{r}\Bigr) X_t \,\mathrm{d}t \to \exp\Bigl(\frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \|f\|^2 \lambda^2\Bigr) \quad \text{as } t \to \infty \,.$$

The weak convergence of distributions follows, see for example [1, Sect. 30, p. 390]. ☐

3 Logarithm of a Gaussian process

The main result of this section, Theorem 3.1, is instrumental in checking splittability of processes of the form $X_t = \log |\xi_t|$ where ξ is a complex-valued Gaussian process. It is used in Sect. 4. Proposition 3.5 is used in Sect. 6.

Here is some background. Real-valued random processes on $\mathbb{R}$ ($X : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$) are defined in the beginning of Sect. 2. Complex-valued random processes on $\mathbb{R}$ ($X : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$) are defined similarly. Let X be a complex-valued process having second moments (that is, $\mathbb{E}\, |X_t|^2 < \infty$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$) and centered (that is, $\mathbb{E}\, X_t = 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$). Such a process is called Gaussian, if for all $n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$, $t_1, \dots, t_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\mathbb{E}\, |a_1 X_{t_1} + \dots + a_n X_{t_n}|^2 = 1$, the distribution of the random variable $a_1 X_{t_1} + \dots + a_n X_{t_n}$ is the standard complex normal distribution γ^1, that is, has the density $z \mapsto \pi^{-1} \mathrm{e}^{-|z|^2}$ w.r.t. Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{C}$. The same holds for processes on $(0,\infty)$, on $\mathbb{R}^2$, and in fact on any measure space with a finite or σ-finite measure. Throughout this work, all Gaussian processes are complex-valued and centered

3.1 Theorem. Let a number $C \in (0,\infty)$ and Gaussian processes ξ, η, η' on $(0,\infty)$ be such that

(a) ξ, η, η' are independent;

(b) η and η' are identically distributed;

(c) for all $u \in [0,1)$,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \bigl(\mathbb{E} \, |\eta(k+u)|^2 \bigr)^{1/2} \le C \, ;$$

(d) for all $u \in [0,1)$, $n \in \{1,2,\dots\}$ and $a_0, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$\mathbb{E} \biggl| \sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k \bigl(\xi(k+u) + \eta(k+u) \bigr) \biggr|^2 \ge \sum_{k=0}^{n} |a_k|^2 \, .$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E} \exp \int_0^\infty \ln^+ \frac{|\xi(t) + \eta'(t)|}{|\xi(t) + \eta(t)|} \, \mathrm{d}t \le \exp\bigl(2\pi (C^2 + C) \bigr) \, .$$

Here $\ln^+(\dots)$ means $\max(0, \ln(\dots))$. The proof of Th. 3.1, given at the end of this section, uses finite-dimensional approximation (Prop. 3.5). See also 6.7.

The standard Gaussian measure γ^n on $\mathbb{C}^n$ has the density $x \mapsto \pi^{-n} \exp(-|x|^2)$, $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$, w.r.t. Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{C}^n$.

Let μ be a (finite positive Borel) measure on $\mathbb{C}^n$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \bigl| \ln |x| \bigr| \, \mu(\mathrm{d}x) < \infty \, . \tag{3.2}$$

We denote by S_μ the random variable

$$S_\mu(u) = \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \ln |\langle x, u \rangle| \, \mu(\mathrm{d}x)$$

on the probability space $(\mathbb{C}^n, \gamma^n)$. It is well-defined and integrable by the Fubini theorem, since

$$\iint_{\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n} \bigl| \ln |\langle x, u \rangle| \bigr| \, \mu(\mathrm{d}x) \gamma^n(\mathrm{d}u) =$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \mu(\mathrm{d}x) \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \gamma^n(\mathrm{d}u) \, \bigl| \ln |\langle x, u \rangle| \bigr| = \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \mu(\mathrm{d}x) \int_{\mathbb{C}} \gamma^1(\mathrm{d}z) \, \bigl| \ln |x| + \ln |z| \bigr| \le$$

$$\le \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \mu(\mathrm{d}x) \left(\bigl| \ln |x| \bigr| + \int_{\mathbb{C}} \gamma^1(\mathrm{d}z) \, \bigl| \ln |z| \bigr| \right) < \infty \, .$$

Let μ, ν be two measures satisfying (3.2). We say that μ and ν are projectively equal, if $\int f \,\mathrm{d}\mu = \int f \,\mathrm{d}\nu$ for every bounded Borel function $f : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(cx) = f(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. Clearly, every μ is projectively equal to some ν concentrated on the unit sphere.

If μ and ν are projectively equal then $S_\mu - S_\nu$ is nonrandom. Namely, $S_\mu(u) - S_\nu(u) = \Delta_{\mu,\nu}$ for almost all u; here $\Delta_{\mu,\nu} = \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \ln|x| \,\mu(\mathrm{d}x) - \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \ln|x| \,\nu(\mathrm{d}x)$. Proof: the function $f_u(x) = \ln|\langle x, u\rangle| - \ln|x|$ satisfies $f(cx) = f(x)$. It is not bounded, however, it is both μ-integrable and ν-integrable for almost every u. For such u we get $\int f_u \,\mathrm{d}\mu = \int f_u \,\mathrm{d}\nu$, thus $S_\mu(u) - S_\nu(u) = \Delta_{\mu,\nu}$.

If μ and ν are projectively equal then the corresponding centered random variables are equal:

$$S_\mu - \mathbb{E}\, S_\mu = S_\nu - \mathbb{E}\, S_\nu \,.$$

Let μ be a measure on $\mathbb{C}^{m+n}$, satisfying (3.2). Then the random variable S_μ is defined on the product $(\mathbb{C}^{m+n}, \gamma^{m+n}) = (\mathbb{C}^m, \gamma^m) \times (\mathbb{C}^n, \gamma^n)$ of two probability spaces. If μ is concentrated on $\mathbb{C}^m \times \{0\}$ then S_μ does not depend on the second argument. If μ is somehow close to $\mathbb{C}^m \times \{0\}$, we may expect that the second argument has a small impact on S_μ. In order to quantify this impact we may consider the function

$$(u, v, w) \mapsto S_\mu(u, v) - S_\mu(u, w) = \int_{\mathbb{C}^{m+n}} \mu(\mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}z) \ln \frac{|\langle y, u\rangle + \langle z, v\rangle|}{|\langle y, u\rangle + \langle z, w\rangle|}$$

as a random variable on the probability space $(\mathbb{C}^m, \gamma^m) \times (\mathbb{C}^n, \gamma^n) \times (\mathbb{C}^n, \gamma^n)$. An upper bound for this random variable is given in Prop. 3.5 under a quite technical (but useful) condition on μ formulated in Def. 3.3. The condition is sensitive to the choice of a measure within a class of projectively equal measures; the conclusion is not.

3.3 Definition. Let μ be a measure on $\mathbb{C}^{m+n}$, and $A, B \in [0, \infty)$. We say that μ is (A, B)-close to $\mathbb{C}^m \times \{0\}$, if it is an integral convex combination (that is, $\mu = \int_0^1 \mu_t \,\mathrm{d}t$) of measures μ_t on $\mathbb{C}^{m+n}$ of the following form: each μ_t is the counting measure on a finite set $\{x_1, \dots, x_K\} \subset \mathbb{C}^{m+n}$ (that is, $\mu_t(A) = \#\{k : x_k \in A\}$; both $x_1, \dots, x_K$ and K may depend on t) satisfying the following conditions formulated in terms of $y_k \in \mathbb{C}^m$, $z_k \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $y_k \oplus z_k = x_k$:

(a) $|z_1| + \dots + |z_K| \le A$;

(b) $|a_1 z_1 + \dots + a_K z_K| \le B$ whenever $a_k \in \mathbb{C}$, $|a_k| \le 1$ for all k;

(c) $|a_1 x_1 + \dots + a_K x_K|^2 \ge |a_1|^2 + \dots + |a_K|^2$ for all $a_1, \dots, a_K \in \mathbb{C}$.

Condition (b) makes sense for $B < A$ (otherwise it follows from (a)).

3.4 Lemma. Let $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{C}^N$ satisfy $|a_1 x_1 + \dots + a_n x_n|^2 \ge |a_1|^2 + \dots + |a_n|^2$ for all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{C}$. Then

$$\int_{\mathbb{C}^N} \gamma^N(\mathrm{d}u) \prod_{k=1}^n f_k(\langle x_k, u \rangle) \le \prod_{k=1}^n \sup_{y \in \mathbb{C}} \int_{\mathbb{C}} \gamma^1(\mathrm{d}z)\, f_k(y+z)$$

for all measurable $f_1, \dots, f_n : \mathbb{C} \to [0, \infty)$.

Proof. The image of γ^N under the map $\mathbb{C}^N \ni u \mapsto \big(\langle x_1, u \rangle, \dots, \langle x_n, u \rangle \big) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ is a centered Gaussian measure γ on $\mathbb{C}^n$ such that $\int |\langle a, v \rangle|^2 \gamma(\mathrm{d}v) \ge |a|^2$ for all $a \in \mathbb{C}^n$. We define another centered Gaussian measure $\tilde\gamma$ on $\mathbb{C}^n$ by

$$\int |\langle a, v \rangle|^2 \, \tilde\gamma(\mathrm{d}v) = \int |\langle a, v \rangle|^2 \, \gamma(\mathrm{d}v) - |a|^2 \quad \text{for all } a \in \mathbb{C}^n$$

and get

$$\int |\langle a, v \rangle|^2 \, \gamma(\mathrm{d}v) = \int |\langle a, v \rangle|^2 \, \gamma^n(\mathrm{d}v) + \int |\langle a, v \rangle|^2 \, \tilde\gamma(\mathrm{d}v) \,,$$

which means convolution,

$$\gamma = \gamma^n * \tilde\gamma \,.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{C}^N} \gamma^N(\mathrm{d}u) \prod_{k=1}^n f_k(\langle x_k, u \rangle) &= \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \gamma(\mathrm{d}v) \prod_{k=1}^n f_k(v_k) = \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \tilde\gamma(\mathrm{d}v) \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \gamma^n(\mathrm{d}w) \prod_{k=1}^n f_k(v_k + w_k) = \\ = \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \tilde\gamma(\mathrm{d}v) \prod_{k=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{C}} \gamma^1(\mathrm{d}z) f_k(v_k + z) &\le \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \tilde\gamma(\mathrm{d}v) \prod_{k=1}^n \sup_{y \in \mathbb{C}} \int_{\mathbb{C}} \gamma^1(\mathrm{d}z) f_k(y+z) \,.\end{aligned}$$

□

3.5 Proposition. Let a measure μ on $\mathbb{C}^{m+n}$, satisfying (3.2), be (A, B)-close to $\mathbb{C}^m \times \{0\}$. Then

$$\iiint_{\mathbb{C}^m \times \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n} \gamma^m(\mathrm{d}u) \gamma^n(\mathrm{d}v) \gamma^n(\mathrm{d}w) \, \exp \int_{\mathbb{C}^{m+n}} \mu(\mathrm{d}y \mathrm{d}z) \ln^+ \frac{|\langle y, u \rangle + \langle z, v \rangle|}{|\langle y, u \rangle + \langle z, w \rangle|} \le \\ \le \exp\big(\pi (A + B^2) \big) \,.$$

Here $\mu(\mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}z)$ means $\mu(\mathrm{d}x)$ where $x = y \oplus z$, $x \in \mathbb{C}^{m+n}$, $y \in \mathbb{C}^m$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$.

Proof. Having $\mu = \int_0^1 \mu_t \, \mathrm{d}t$ (according to Def. 3.3), we may prove the inequality for μ_t instead of μ (for every t), since $\exp \int \mu(\mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}z) \ln^+(\dots) = \exp \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}t \int \mu_t(\mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}z) \ln^+(\dots) \le \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}t \exp \int \mu_t(\mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}z) \ln^+(\dots)$. The measure μ_t being the counting measure on a finite set of vectors $x_k = y_k \oplus z_k$ ($k = 1, \dots, K$, $y_k \in \mathbb{C}^m$, $z_k \in \mathbb{C}^n$), we have to prove that

$$\iiint_{\mathbb{C}^m \times \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n} \gamma^m(\mathrm{d}u)\gamma^n(\mathrm{d}v)\gamma^n(\mathrm{d}w) \prod_{k=1}^{K} \max\left(1, \frac{|\langle y_k, u\rangle + \langle z_k, v\rangle|}{|\langle y_k, u\rangle + \langle z_k, w\rangle|}\right) \le \\ \le \exp\bigl(\pi(A + B^2)\bigr) \, ,$$

given that (a) $\sum_k |z_k| \le A$, (b) $|\sum a_k z_k| \le B$ whenever $|a_k| \le 1$, and (c) $|\sum_k a_k y_k|^2 + |\sum_k a_k z_k|^2 \ge \sum_k |a_k|^2$ for all $a_1, \dots, a_K \in \mathbb{C}$.

We transform the integral in v and w by the transformation

$$(v, w) \mapsto \Bigl(\frac{v - w}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{v + w}{\sqrt{2}}\Bigr)$$

that is well-known to preserve the measure $\gamma^n \times \gamma^n$ on $\mathbb{C}^n \times C^n$. Using also the evident inequality

$$\frac{|\langle y_k, u\rangle + \langle z_k, v\rangle|}{|\langle y_k, u\rangle + \langle z_k, w\rangle|} \le 1 + \frac{|\langle z_k, v - w\rangle|}{|\langle y_k, u\rangle + \langle z_k, w\rangle|} \, ,$$

we get

$$\iint_{\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n} \gamma^n(\mathrm{d}v)\gamma^n(\mathrm{d}w) \prod_{k=1}^{K} \max\left(1, \frac{|\langle y_k, u\rangle + \langle z_k, v\rangle|}{|\langle y_k, u\rangle + \langle z_k, w\rangle|}\right) \le \\ \le \iint_{\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n} \gamma^n(\mathrm{d}v)\gamma^n(\mathrm{d}w) \prod_{k=1}^{K} \left(1 + \frac{|\langle z_k, \sqrt{2}w\rangle|}{|\langle y_k, u\rangle + \langle z_k, v + w\rangle/\sqrt{2}|}\right) = \\ = \iint_{\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n} \gamma^n(\mathrm{d}v)\gamma^n(\mathrm{d}w) \prod_{k=1}^{K} \left(1 + \frac{2|\langle z_k, w\rangle|}{|\langle \sqrt{2}y_k \oplus z_k, u \oplus v\rangle + \langle z_k, w\rangle|}\right) .$$

Applying Lemma 3.4 to the Gaussian measure $\gamma^m \times \gamma^n$ on $\mathbb{C}^{m+n}$, functions

$$f_k(t) = 1 + \frac{2|\langle z_k, w\rangle|}{|t + \langle z_k, w\rangle|}$$

and vectors $\sqrt{2}y_k \oplus z_k$ ($k = 1, \dots, K$) we get

$$\iint_{\mathbb{C}^m \times \mathbb{C}^n} \gamma^m(\mathrm{d}u)\gamma^n(\mathrm{d}v) \prod_{k=1}^{K} \left(1 + \frac{2|\langle z_k, w\rangle|}{|\langle \sqrt{2}y_k \oplus z_k, u \oplus v\rangle + \langle z_k, w\rangle|}\right) \le \\ \le \prod_{k=1}^{K} \sup_{s \in \mathbb{C}} \int_{\mathbb{C}} \gamma^1(\mathrm{d}t) \Bigl(1 + \frac{2|\langle z_k, w\rangle|}{|s + t|}\Bigr) .$$

The supremum is achieved at $s = 0$ (which is a special case of the Anderson inequality, see for instance [2, Th. 1.8.5 and Cor. 1.8.6]). Taking into account that

$$\int_{\mathbb{C}} \frac{\gamma^1(\mathrm{d}t)}{|t|} = \frac{2\pi}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{r} \mathrm{e}^{-r^2} r \mathrm{d}r = \sqrt{\pi}$$

we get

$$\iint_{\mathbb{C}^m \times \mathbb{C}^n} \gamma^m(\mathrm{d}u)\gamma^n(\mathrm{d}v) \prod_{k=1}^K \left(1 + \frac{2|\langle z_k, w\rangle|}{|\langle \sqrt{2}y_k \oplus z_k, u \oplus v\rangle + \langle z_k, w\rangle|}\right) \le \\ \le \prod_{k=1}^K \bigl(1 + 2\sqrt{\pi}|\langle z_k, w\rangle|\bigr) \le \exp\left(2\sqrt{\pi} \sum_{k=1}^K |\langle z_k, w\rangle|\right).$$

Thus,

$$\iiint_{\mathbb{C}^m \times \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n} \gamma^m(\mathrm{d}u)\gamma^n(\mathrm{d}v)\gamma^n(\mathrm{d}w) \prod_{k=1}^K \max\left(1, \frac{|\langle y_k, u\rangle + \langle z_k, v\rangle|}{|\langle y_k, u\rangle + \langle z_k, w\rangle|}\right) \le \\ \iiint_{\mathbb{C}^m \times \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n} \gamma^m(\mathrm{d}u)\gamma^n(\mathrm{d}v)\gamma^n(\mathrm{d}w) \prod_{k=1}^K \left(1 + \frac{2|\langle z_k, w\rangle|}{|\langle \sqrt{2}y_k \oplus z_k, u \oplus v\rangle + \langle z_k, w\rangle|}\right) \\ \le \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \gamma^n(\mathrm{d}w) \exp\bigl(2\sqrt{\pi} f(w)\bigr),$$

where $f(w) = \sum_{k=1}^K |\langle z_k, w\rangle|$; it is sufficient to prove that

$$\int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \gamma^n(\mathrm{d}w) \exp\bigl(2\sqrt{\pi} f(w)\bigr) \le \exp\bigl(\pi(A + B^2)\bigr).$$

It is well-known that[2]

$$\int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \exp(\lambda f)\, \mathrm{d}\gamma^n \le \exp\left(\frac{1}{4}\lambda^2 C^2 + \lambda \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} f\, \mathrm{d}\gamma^n\right)$$

for every $f : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the Lipschitz condition with constant C, and every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$; see [2, (1.7.8)]. (The coefficient $1/4$ before $\lambda^2 C^2$ differs from the coefficient $1/2$ in [2] because the standard Gaussian measures on $\mathbb{C}^n$ and $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ have different covariations.) It remains to check that, first, $\int f\, \mathrm{d}\gamma^n \le \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\pi} A$, and second, f is Lipschitz with the constant (at most) B.

---

[2] Alternatively we could use Fernique's theorem (see for instance [2, Th. 2.8.5]), getting worse constants.

The former follows from the inequality $\sum_k |z_k| \le A$ and the fact that

$$\int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \gamma^n(\mathrm{d}w)\, |\langle z_k, w\rangle| = |z_k| \cdot \int_{\mathbb{C}} |t| \gamma^1(\mathrm{d}t) = |z_k| \cdot \frac{2\pi}{\pi} \int_0^\infty r\mathrm{e}^{-r^2} r\mathrm{d}r = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} |z_k|\,.$$

Finally, the gradient of f is of the form $\sum_k a_k z_k$, $|a_k| \le 1$; we know that $|\sum_k a_k z_k| \le B$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Given $m \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$, we restrict our processes ξ, η, η' to $(0, m)$; accordingly, we replace '$\sum_{k=0}^\infty$' with '$\sum_{k=0}^{m-1}$' in (c); '$n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$' with '$n \in \{1, 2, \dots, m-1\}$' (or just '$n = m - 1$') in (d); and '$\int_0^\infty \dots \mathrm{d}t$' with '$\int_0^m \dots \mathrm{d}t$' in the conclusion. It is sufficient to prove this modified theorem (for all m), since the limit $m \to \infty$ gives the original theorem.

The random variables ξ_t for $t \in (0, m)$ span a (closed linear) subspace $G^{(\xi)}$ of the Hilbert space $L_2(\Omega)$ of square integrable random variables. We choose an increasing sequence of n-dimensional subspaces $G_n^{(\xi)} \subset G^{(\xi)}$ whose union is dense in $G^{(\xi)}$. For each n we construct a Gaussian random process ξ_n on $(0, m)$ as follows: for every $t \in (0, m)$ the random variable $\xi_n(t)$ is the orthogonal projection of $\xi(t)$ to $G_n^{(\xi)}$. We construct processes η_n in the same way. (No need to coordinate the choice of $G_n^{(\eta)}$ with the choice of $G_n^{(\xi)}$.) Constructing η'_n we use the natural unitary correspondence between $G^{(\eta)}$ and $G^{(\eta')}$ (namely, $\eta'(t)$ corresponds to $\eta(t)$ for each t), and construct η'_n such that $\eta'_n(t)$ corresponds to $\eta_n(t)$. Thus, for every n the three processes ξ_n, η_n, η'_n satisfy Conditions (a), (b). Condition (c) is also satisfied (just because the projection never increases norms). However, Condition (d) may be violated.

Given $\varepsilon > 0$, we'll prove the theorem with C replaced by $(1+\varepsilon)C$ in the conclusion (but not in Condition (c)); this is evidently sufficient.

We define measurable sets $A_n \subset [0, 1)$ as follows: $u \in A_n$ if and only if the inequality

$$(1+\varepsilon)^2 \mathbb{E} \biggl| \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} a_k \bigl(\xi_n(k+u) + \eta_n(k+u) \bigr) \biggr|^2 \ge \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} |a_k|^2$$

holds for all $a_0, \dots, a_{m-1} \in \mathbb{C}$. The left-hand side is increasing in n (since $\xi_n + \eta_n$ is a projection of $\xi_{n+1} + \eta_{n+1}$), thus $A_1 \subset A_2 \subset \dots$ Also, $\xi_n(k+u) + \eta_n(k+u) \to \xi(k+u) + \eta(k+u)$ (in L_2, as $n \to \infty$); we have an increasing sequence of quadratic forms on $\mathbb{C}^m$, and their limit is strictly larger than 1 everywhere on the unit sphere. We see that $u \in A_n$ for all n large enough; that is, $A_n \uparrow [0, 1)$. We introduce $B_n = \bigcup_{k=0}^{m-1} (k + A_n)$ and get $B_n \uparrow [0, m)$.

On the other hand, $\xi_n(t) \to \xi(t)$ (as $n \to \infty$) a.s. (martingale convergence!) for each t (separately); thus, $\xi_n(t, \omega) \to \xi(t, \omega)$ for almost all pairs

(t,ω). Also, $\xi_n(t,\omega)\mathbf{1}_{B_n}(t) \to \xi(t,\omega)$ (here $\mathbf{1}_{B_n}$ is the indicator of B_n). We apply Fatou's lemma twice. First,

$$\int_0^m \mathrm{d}t\, \ln^+ \frac{|\xi(t)+\eta'(t)|}{|\xi(t)+\eta(t)|} \le \liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_{B_n} \mathrm{d}t\, \ln^+ \frac{|\xi_n(t)+\eta'_n(t)|}{|\xi_n(t)+\eta_n(t)|}$$

for almost all ω; and second,

$$\mathbb{E}\, \exp \int_0^m \mathrm{d}t\, \ln^+ \frac{|\xi(t)+\eta'(t)|}{|\xi(t)+\eta(t)|} \le \liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\, \exp \int_{B_n} \mathrm{d}t\, \ln^+ \frac{|\xi_n(t)+\eta'_n(t)|}{|\xi_n(t)+\eta_n(t)|}\,.$$

It remains to prove the inequality

$$\mathbb{E}\, \exp \int_{B_n} \mathrm{d}t\, \ln^+ \frac{|\xi_n(t)+\eta'_n(t)|}{|\xi_n(t)+\eta_n(t)|} \le \exp\bigl(2\pi((1+\varepsilon)^2C^2 + (1+\varepsilon)C)\bigr)$$

for all n. To this end we identify both $G_n^{(\xi)}$ and $G_n^{(\eta)}$ with $\mathbb{C}^n$, define a measure μ on $G_n^{(\xi)} \oplus G_n^{(\eta)}$ by

$$\int \varphi(x\oplus y)\, \mu(\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y) = \int_{B_n} \varphi\bigl((1+\varepsilon)\xi(t), (1+\varepsilon)\eta(t)\bigr)\, \mathrm{d}t$$

(for all bounded Borel functions $\varphi : G_n^{(\xi)} \oplus G_n^{(\eta)} \to \mathbb{R}$), and apply Prop. 3.5, taking A and B of 3.5 both equal to $(1+\varepsilon)C$. $\Box$

4 An example of a splittable process

The random process considered in this section is a one-dimensional counterpart of the random field examined in Sect. 6. Many arguments of this section are reused in Sect. 6.

4.1 Proposition. Let $\xi = (\xi_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ be a stationary centered Gaussian complex-valued random process such that

$$\mathbb{E}\, \xi_s \overline{\xi_t} = \exp\bigl(-0.5|s-t|^2\bigr)$$

for $s,t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the stationary real-valued random process $X = (X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ defined by

$$X_t = \ln|\xi_t| + 0.5C_{\mathrm{Euler}}$$

is splittable. (Here $C_{\mathrm{Euler}} = 0.577\dots$ is the Euler constant.)

Proof. First,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\,\exp|X_0| \le \exp(0.5C_{\text{Euler}})\mathbb{E}\,\max(|\xi_0|,1/|\xi_0|) = \\ = \exp(0.5C_{\text{Euler}})\int \max(|z|,1/|z|)\gamma^1(\mathrm{d}z) = \\ = \exp(0.5C_{\text{Euler}})\cdot\frac{2\pi}{\pi}\int_0^\infty \max(r,1/r)\mathrm{e}^{-r^2}r\,\mathrm{d}r < \infty\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\,X_0 = 0.5C_{\text{Euler}} + \int \ln|z|\,\gamma^1(\mathrm{d}z) = 0.5C_{\text{Euler}} + \frac{2\pi}{\pi}\int_0^\infty \ln r\cdot\mathrm{e}^{-r^2}r\,\mathrm{d}r = \\ = 0.5C_{\text{Euler}} + 0.5\int_0^\infty \ln x\cdot\mathrm{e}^{-x}\,\mathrm{d}x = 0\,.\end{aligned}$$

We have to find X^0, X^-, X^+ satisfying Conditions (a), (b), (c) of Def. 1.

Defining a map $\Xi : \mathbb{R} \to L_2(\mathbb{R})$ by

$$\Xi(t)(s) = (2/\pi)^{1/4}\exp\bigl(-(s-t)^2\bigr)\,,$$

we get

$$\mathbb{E}\,\xi_s\overline{\xi_t} = \langle\Xi(s),\Xi(t)\rangle\,,$$

since

$$\langle\Xi(-t),\Xi(t)\rangle = (2/\pi)^{1/2}\int \exp\bigl(-(s-t)^2-(s+t)^2\bigr)\mathrm{d}s = \exp(-(2t)^2/2)\,.$$

We split Ξ into Ξ_- and Ξ_+,

$$\Xi_-(t) = \Xi(t)\cdot\mathbf{1}_{(-\infty,0)}\,,\quad \Xi_+(t) = \Xi(t)\cdot\mathbf{1}_{(0,\infty)}\,;$$

as before, $\mathbf{1}_A$ is the indicator of A. Clearly,

$$\mathbb{E}\,\xi_s\overline{\xi_t} = \langle\Xi_-(s),\Xi_-(t)\rangle + \langle\Xi_+(s),\Xi_+(t)\rangle\,.$$

(In fact, $\langle\Xi_-(s),\Xi_-(t)\rangle = \Phi(-s-t)\exp\bigl(-0.5(s-t)^2\bigr)$ and $\langle\Xi_+(s),\Xi_+(t)\rangle = \Phi(s+t)\exp\bigl(-0.5(s-t)^2\bigr)$, where $\Phi(t) = (2\pi)^{-1/2}\int_{-\infty}^t \mathrm{e}^{-u^2/2}\,\mathrm{d}u$.) We construct (on some probability space) two independent centered Gaussian complex-valued random processes ξ_-, ξ_+ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\,\xi_-(s)\overline{\xi_-(t)} = \langle\Xi_-(s),\Xi_-(t)\rangle\,,\\ \mathbb{E}\,\xi_+(s)\overline{\xi_+(t)} = \langle\Xi_+(s),\Xi_+(t)\rangle\,,\end{aligned}$$

then the process $\xi_- + \xi_+$ is distributed like ξ. Further, we construct (on some probability space) four independent processes $\xi_-^-, \xi_-^+, \xi_+^-, \xi_+^+$ such that ξ_-^-, ξ_-^+ are distributed like ξ_- each, while ξ_+^-, ξ_+^+ — like ξ_+. The four processes $\xi_-^- + \xi_+^-$, $\xi_-^- + \xi_+^+$, $\xi_-^+ + \xi_+^-$, $\xi_-^+ + \xi_+^+$ are distributed like ξ each. Also, the two processes $\xi_-^- + \xi_+^-$, $\xi_-^+ + \xi_+^+$ are independent. We define X^0, X^-, X^+ by

$$\begin{aligned} X_t^0 &= \ln |\xi_-^-(t) + \xi_+^+(t)| + 0.5 C_{\text{Euler}} \,, \\ X_t^- &= \ln |\xi_-^-(t) + \xi_+^-(t)| + 0.5 C_{\text{Euler}} \,, \\ X_t^+ &= \ln |\xi_-^+(t) + \xi_+^+(t)| + 0.5 C_{\text{Euler}} \end{aligned}$$

and observe that they satisfy Conditions (a), (b); Condition (c) has to be verified.

Using the Hölder inequality and evident symmetries,

$$\begin{gathered} \mathbb{E} \exp \biggl(\int_{-\infty}^0 |X_t^- - X_t^0| \, \mathrm{d}t + \int_0^\infty |X_t^+ - X_t^0| \, \mathrm{d}t \biggr) \le \mathbb{E} \exp \biggl(2 \int_0^\infty |X_t^+ - X_t^0| \, \mathrm{d}t \biggr) \\ = \mathbb{E} \exp \biggl(2 \int_0^\infty \bigl(X_t^+ - X_t^0 \bigr)^- \, \mathrm{d}t + 2 \int_0^\infty \bigl(X_t^+ - X_t^0 \bigr)^+ \, \mathrm{d}t \biggr) \le \\ \le \mathbb{E} \exp 4 \int_0^\infty \bigl(X_t^+ - X_t^0 \bigr)^+ \, \mathrm{d}t = \mathbb{E} \exp 4 \int_0^\infty \ln^+ \frac{|\xi_-^+(t) + \xi_+^+(t)|}{|\xi_-^-(t) + \xi_+^+(t)|} \, \mathrm{d}t = \\ = \mathbb{E} \exp \int_0^\infty \ln^+ \frac{|\tilde\xi(t) + \eta'(t)|}{|\tilde\xi(t) + \eta(t)|} \, \mathrm{d}t \,, \end{gathered}$$

where $\tilde\xi$, η and η' are defined by

$$\tilde\xi(t) = R \xi_+^+(0.25t) \,, \quad \eta(t) = R \xi_-^-(0.25t) \,, \quad \eta'(t) = R \xi_-^+(0.25t) \,;$$

the constant $R \in (0, \infty)$ will be chosen later. Finiteness of this expectation is ensured by Theorem 3.1 provided that Conditions 3.1(a,b,c,d) are satisfied by $\tilde\xi$, η and η' (for some R and C).

Conditions 3.1(a,b) are satisfied evidently. Condition (c) is satisfied for $C = R \sum_{k=0}^\infty \| \Xi_-(0.25k) \| < \infty$, since

$$\begin{gathered} \sum_{k=0}^\infty \bigl(\mathbb{E} \, |\eta(k+u)|^2 \bigr)^{1/2} = R \sum_{k=0}^\infty \bigl(\mathbb{E} \, |\xi_-(0.25(k+u))|^2 \bigr)^{1/2} = \\ = R \sum_{k=0}^\infty \| \Xi_-(0.25(k+u)) \| \le C \,. \end{gathered}$$

It remains to verify 3.1(d). We have

$$\mathbb{E}\Big|\sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k\big(\tilde{\xi}(k+u)+\eta(k+u)\big)\Big|^2 =$$

$$= R^2\mathbb{E}\Big|\sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k\xi\big(0.25(k+u)\big)\Big|^2 = R^2\Big\|\sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k\Xi(0.25k)\Big\|^2 .$$

Now we use unitarity of Fourier transform; taking into account that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int \Xi(t)(s)\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\lambda s}\,\mathrm{d}s = (2\pi)^{-1/4}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\lambda t}\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda^2/4}$$

we get

$$\Big\|\sum_k a_k\Xi(0.25k)\Big\|^2 = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\Big|\sum_k a_k\Xi(0.25k)(s)\Big|^2\,\mathrm{d}s =$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\Big|\sum_k a_k(2\pi)^{-1/4}\exp(0.25\mathrm{i}\lambda k)\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda^2/4}\Big|^2\,\mathrm{d}\lambda =$$

$$= (2\pi)^{-1/2}\int_0^{8\pi}\Big|\sum_k a_k\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\lambda k/4}\Big|^2\Big(\sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}}\exp(-0.5(\lambda+8l\pi)^2)\Big)\,\mathrm{d}\lambda \ge$$

$$\ge \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\cdot 8\pi\Big(\sum_k |a_k|^2\Big)\inf_{\lambda\in(0,8\pi)}\sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}}\exp(-0.5(\lambda+8l\pi)^2) .$$

It remains to choose R such that

$$R^2\cdot\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\cdot 8\pi\inf_{\lambda\in(0,8\pi)}\sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}}\exp(-0.5(\lambda+8l\pi)^2) \ge 1 .$$

□

5 Splittable random fields

Random fields on the plane are examined in this section. The main results are two-dimensional counterparts of Theorem 2 and Corollaries 3, 4, formulated below (5.2–5.4) after a two-dimensional counterpart of Definition 1.

Random processes on $\mathbb{R}$ ($X : \mathbb{R}\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R}$) are defined in the beginning of Sect. 2. Random fields on $\mathbb{R}^2$ ($X : \mathbb{R}^2\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R}$) are defined similarly. A random field X is called stationary,[3] if for every $s\in\mathbb{R}^2$ the shifted field $(t,\omega)\mapsto X(s+t,\omega)$ is distributed like X.

---

[3] In other words, homogeneous.

5.1 Definition. A stationary random field $X = (X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}^2}$ is *splittable,* if it is C-splittable (see below) for some $C \in (0, \infty)$.

A stationary random field $X = (X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}^2}$ is *C-splittable,* if $\mathbb{E} \exp |X_0| \le C$, $\mathbb{E}\, X_0 = 0$, and there exists (on some probability space) a family of 9 random fields $X^{k,l}$, $k \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$, $l \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$, such that

(a1) the two triples $(X^{-,-}, X^{-,0}, X^{-,+})$ and $(X^{+,-}, X^{+,0}, X^{+,+})$ are independent,

(a2) the two triples $(X^{-,-}, X^{0,-}, X^{+,-})$ and $(X^{-,+}, X^{0,+}, X^{+,+})$ are independent;

(b1) each $X^{k,l}$ is distributed like X,

(b2) the joint distribution of the three processes $X^{k,-}, X^{k,0}, X^{k,+}$ does not depend on $k \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$,

(b3) the joint distribution of the three processes $X^{-,l}, X^{0,l}, X^{+,l}$ does not depend on $l \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$;

(c1) $\mathbb{E} \exp \int_{\mathbb{R}} |X^{0,0}_{t_1,0} - X^{\operatorname{sgn} t_1, 0}_{t_1,0}| \,\mathrm{d}t_1 \le C$,

(c2) $\mathbb{E} \exp\bigl(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |X^{0,0}_{0,t_2} - X^{0,\operatorname{sgn} t_2}_{0,t_2}| \,\mathrm{d}t_2 \le C$,

(c3) $\mathbb{E} \exp \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} |X^{0,0}_{t_1,t_2} - X^{\operatorname{sgn} t_1, 0}_{t_1,t_2} - X^{0, \operatorname{sgn} t_2}_{t_1,t_2} + X^{\operatorname{sgn} t_1, \operatorname{sgn} t_2}_{t_1,t_2}| \,\mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2 \le C$.

Of course, $X^{-,-}$ is an abbreviation of $X^{-1,-1}$; also, $\operatorname{sgn} t$ is -1 for $t < 0$, 0 for $x = 0$, and $+1$ for $x > 0$.

According to Def. 5.1, all splittable random fields are stationary.

5.2 Theorem. For every splittable random field X there exists $\sigma \in [0, \infty)$ such that for every compactly supported continuous function $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{\substack{r \to \infty \\ \lambda \log^2 r \to 0}} \frac{1}{r^2 \lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} f\Bigl(\frac{t_1}{r}, \frac{t_2}{r} \Bigr) X_{t_1,t_2} \,\mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \|f\|^2_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \,.$$

For the proof see the end of this section.

5.3 Corollary. Let X, σ and f be as in Theorem 5.2, and $\sigma \ne 0$. Then

$$\lim_{\substack{r \to \infty, c \to \infty \\ (c \log^2 r)/r \to 0}} \frac{1}{c^2} \ln \mathbb{P} \biggl(\iint f\Bigl(\frac{t_1}{r}, \frac{t_2}{r} \Bigr) X_{t_1,t_2} \,\mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2 \ge c\sigma \|f\| r \biggr) = -\frac{1}{2} \,.$$

5.4 Corollary. Let X, σ and f be as in Theorem 5.2. Then the distribution of $r^{-1} \iint f\bigl(\frac{t_1}{r}, \frac{t_2}{r} \bigr) X_{t_1,t_2} \,\mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2$ converges (as $r \to \infty$) to the normal distribution $N(0, \sigma^2 \|f\|^2)$.

Random processes are instrumental in examining random fields. We generalize Definition 1 and Theorem 2.16 to nonstationary processes as follows.

5.5 Definition. A random process $X = (X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is *splittable,* if it is C-splittable (see below) for some $C \in (0, \infty)$.

A random process $X = (X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is *C-splittable,* if for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, first, $\mathbb{E} \exp |X_t| \le C$, second, $\mathbb{E} X_t = 0$, and third, there exists (on some probability space) a triple of random processes X^0, X^-, X^+ such that

(a) the two processes X^-, X^+ are independent;

(b) the four processes X, X^0, X^-, X^+ are identically distributed;

(c) $\mathbb{E} \exp\bigl(\int_{-\infty}^t |X_s^- - X_s^0| \, \mathrm{d}s + \int_t^\infty |X_s^+ - X_s^0| \, \mathrm{d}s\bigr) \le C$.

5.6 Theorem. For every $C \in (0, \infty)$ there exist $R \in (1, \infty)$, $\delta > 0$ and $M < \infty$ such that for every C-splittable process X,

$$\frac{1}{r\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_0^r f(t) X_t \, \mathrm{d}t \le M$$

for all $r \in [R, \infty)$, $\lambda \in [-\frac{\delta}{\ln r}, 0) \cup (0, \frac{\delta}{\ln r}]$ and all measurable functions $f : \mathbb{R} \to [-1, 1]$.

Proof. The proof of Theorem 2.16 (and Lemma 2.6) needs only a trivial adaptation. □

Stationary random fields can lead to nonstationary random processes as follows. For relevance of the process V see 5.8.

5.7 Lemma. Let X be a splittable random field, $X^{k,l}$ as in Def. 5.1, and $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to [-1, 1]$ a measurable function. Then the random process V defined by

$$V_{t_2} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t_1, t_2) \bigl(X^{0,0}_{t_1,t_2} - X^{\operatorname{sgn} t_1, 0}_{t_1,t_2} \bigr) \, \mathrm{d}t_1 \quad \text{for } t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$$

is splittable. Moreover, if X is C-splittable then V is C-splittable (for the same C).

Proof. Let X be C-splittable, and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. We have

$$\mathbb{E} \exp |V_t| \le \mathbb{E} \exp \int_{\mathbb{R}} |X^{0,0}_{t_1,t} - X^{\operatorname{sgn} t_1, 0}_{t_1,t}| \, \mathrm{d}t_1 = \mathbb{E} \exp \int_{\mathbb{R}} |X^{0,0}_{t_1,0} - X^{\operatorname{sgn} t_1, 0}_{t_1,0}| \, \mathrm{d}t_1 \le C \, ,$$

since the distribution of $\bigl(X^{0,0}_{t_1,t_2-s} - X^{\operatorname{sgn} t_1, 0}_{t_1,t_2-s} \bigr)_{t_1,t_2 \in \mathbb{R}}$ does not depend on s. Clearly, $\mathbb{E} V_t = 0$. We define

$$V^k_{t_2} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t_1, t_2) \bigl(X^{0,k}_{t_1,t_2-t} - X^{\operatorname{sgn} t_1, k}_{t_1,t_2-t} \bigr) \, \mathrm{d}t_1$$

for $t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $k \in \{-1, 0, +1\}$, and check Conditions 5.5(a,b,c).

(a) V^-, V^+ are independent, since V^- involves only $X^{-,-}, X^{0,-}, X^{+,-}$, while V^+ involves only $X^{-,+}, X^{0,+}, X^{+,+}$.

(b) Each V^k is distributed like V, since the distribution of $\bigl(X^{0,k}_{t_1,t_2-s} - X^{\operatorname{sgn} t_1,k}_{t_1,t_2-s}\bigr)_{t_1,t_2\in\mathbb{R}}$ does not depend on s and k.

(c)

$$\begin{gathered}\mathbb{E}\,\exp\biggl(\int_{-\infty}^{t}|V^-_s - V^0_s|\,\mathrm{d}s + \int_t^{\infty}|V^+_s - V^0_s|\,\mathrm{d}s\biggr) = \\ = \mathbb{E}\,\exp\int_{\mathbb{R}}|V^{\operatorname{sgn}(t_2-t)}_{t_2} - V^0_{t_2}|\,\mathrm{d}t_2 = \mathbb{E}\,\exp\int_{\mathbb{R}}|V^{\operatorname{sgn} t_2}_{t_2+t} - V^0_{t_2+t}|\,\mathrm{d}t_2 = \\ = \mathbb{E}\,\exp\int_{\mathbb{R}}\mathrm{d}t_2\Bigl|\int_{\mathbb{R}}\mathrm{d}t_1 f(t_1,t_2+t)\bigl(X^{0,\operatorname{sgn} t_2}_{t_1,t_2} - X^{\operatorname{sgn} t_1,\operatorname{sgn} t_2}_{t_1,t_2} - X^{0,0}_{t_1,t_2} + X^{\operatorname{sgn} t_1,0}_{t_1,t_2}\Bigr| \le \\ \le \mathbb{E}\,\exp\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2}|X^{0,\operatorname{sgn} t_2}_{t_1,t_2} - X^{\operatorname{sgn} t_1,\operatorname{sgn} t_2}_{t_1,t_2} - X^{0,0}_{t_1,t_2} + X^{\operatorname{sgn} t_1,0}_{t_1,t_2}|\,\mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2 \le C\,.\end{gathered}$$

□

Here is a two-dimensional counterpart of Lemma 2.6(b).

5.8 Proposition. For every $C \in (0,\infty)$ there exist $R \in (1,\infty)$, $\delta > 0$ and $M < \infty$ such that for every C-splittable random field X the following holds.

Let $G \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a rectangle of height $r \ge R$, split by a vertical line in two rectangles G_1, G_2. (In other words: $G = [a_1,a_3]\times[b_1,b_2]$, $G_1 = [a_1,a_2]\times[b_1,b_2]$, $G_2 = [a_2,a_3]\times[b_1,b_2]$, and $b_2 - b_1 = r \ge R$.) Let $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to [-1,1]$ be a measurable function. Then there exist (om some probability space) random variables Y_1, Y_2 and Z such that

(a) Y_1, Y_2 are independent;

(b) Y_k is distributed like $\iint_{G_k} f(t_1,t_2)X_{t_1,t_2}\,\mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2$ (for $k = 1,2$);

(c) $Y_1 + Y_2 + Z$ is distributed like $\iint_G f(t_1,t_2)X_{t_1,t_2}\,\mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2$;

(d) $\ln\mathbb{E}\,\exp\lambda Z \le Mr\lambda^2$ for all $\lambda \in [-\frac{\delta}{\ln r}, \frac{\delta}{\ln r}]$.

Proof. Without loss of generality we assume that $a_2 = 0$. Using the 9 random fields $X^{k,l}$ of Def. 5.1 we define

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1 &= \iint_{G_1} f(t_1,t_2)X^{-,0}_{t_1,t_2}\mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2 = \int_{a_1}^{0}\mathrm{d}t_1\int_{b_1}^{b_2}\mathrm{d}t_2 f(t_1,t_2)X^{-,0}_{t_1,t_2}\,, \\ Y_2 &= \iint_{G_2} f(t_1,t_2)X^{+,0}_{t_1,t_2}\mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2 = \int_{0}^{a_3}\mathrm{d}t_1\int_{b_1}^{b_2}\mathrm{d}t_2 f(t_1,t_2)X^{+,0}_{t_1,t_2}\,, \\ Z &= \iint_{G} f(t_1,t_2)\bigl(X^{0,0}_{t_1,t_2} - X^{\operatorname{sgn} t_1,0}_{t_1,t_2}\bigr)\mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2\,. \end{aligned}$$

Conditions (a), (b) hold evidently. Condition (c) holds, since $Y_1 + Y_2 + Z = \iint_G f(t_1,t_2)X^{0,0}_{t_1,t_2}\,\mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2$.

Lemma 5.7 applied to the function $(t_1, t_2) \mapsto f(t_1, t_2) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[a_1,a_3]}(t_1)$ states that the process $V_{t_2} = \int_{a_1}^{a_3} \mathrm{d}t_1 f(t_1, t_2)\big(X^{0,0}_{t_1,t_2} - X^{\operatorname{sgn} t_1,0}_{t_1,t_2}\big)$ is C-splittable. We note that $\int_{b_1}^{b_2} V_{t_2}\,\mathrm{d}t_2 = Z$. Theorem 5.6 gives us R, δ and M (dependent on C only) such that $\ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda Z \le Mr\lambda^2$ provided that $b_2 - b_1 = r \ge R$ and $\lambda \in [-\frac{\delta}{\ln r}, \frac{\delta}{\ln r}]$. $\square$

5.9 Remark. The same holds for a rectangle split by a *horizontal* line, since Def. 5.1 is symmetric w.r.t. the interchange of the two coordinates, $(X_{t_1,t_2})_{t_1,t_2} \mapsto (X_{t_2,t_1})_{t_1,t_2}$.

In the following proposition, the simplest case $d = 0$ amounts to Prop. 1.5 plus a part (upper bound) of Prop. 1.28. The case $d = 1$ is used in the proof of Th. 5.2 in two ways: via 5.20, and via 5.13 - 5.14 - 5.16 - 5.17 - 5.18 - 5.19.

5.10 Proposition. Let functions $f_n, g_n : (0,\infty) \to [0,\infty]$ satisfy

$$f_{n+1}(\lambda) \le \frac{2}{p} f_n(p\lambda) + \frac{p-1}{p} g_n\Big(\frac{p}{p-1}\lambda\Big)$$

for all n, λ and $p \in (1,\infty)$, and

$$\limsup_{\lambda\to 0+} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} f_n(\lambda) < \infty$$

for all n. Let $d \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. If

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty, \lambda n^d \to 0+} \frac{1}{(2\theta)^n \lambda^2} g_n(\lambda) < \infty \quad \text{for some } \theta \in (0,1)\,,$$

then

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty, \lambda n^{d+1}\to 0+} \frac{1}{2^n \lambda^2} f_n(\lambda) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \limsup_{\lambda\to 0+} \frac{1}{2^n\lambda^2} f_n(\lambda) < \infty\,.$$

Proof. We take $\theta \in (0,1)$, $\delta > 0$ and N such that

$$\sup_{n\ge N, \lambda n^d \le \delta} \frac{1}{(2\theta)^n \lambda^2} g_n(\lambda) = M < \infty\,.$$

Given $n > N$, we define functions $h_N, h_{N+1}, \dots, h_n : (0,\infty) \to [0,\infty]$ by

$$h_k(\lambda) = f_k(\delta n^{-d} \lambda)\,.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} h_{k+1}(\lambda) = f_{k+1}(\delta n^{-d}\lambda) \le \frac{2}{p} f_k(p\delta n^{-d}\lambda) + \frac{p-1}{p} g_k\Big(\frac{p}{p-1}\delta n^{-d}\lambda\Big) \le \\ \le \frac{2}{p} h_k(p\lambda) + \frac{p-1}{p} M(2\theta)^k \Big(\frac{p}{p-1}\delta n^{-d}\lambda\Big)^2 = \\ = \frac{2}{p} h_k(p\lambda) + \frac{p}{p-1} M(2\theta)^k (\delta n^{-d})^2 \lambda^2 \end{aligned}$$

for all p such that $\frac{p}{p-1}\delta n^{-d}\lambda \cdot n^d \le \delta$, that is, $\frac{p}{p-1}\lambda \le 1$. It means that

$h_{k+1} \le (h_k)_+[C_k]$, where $C_k = M(2\theta)^k(\delta n^{-d})^2 \quad (k = N, N+1, \dots, n-1)$.

By Prop. 1.6(a),

$$\frac{1}{2^{n-N}} h_n(\lambda) \le (1-\varepsilon) h_N\Big(\frac{\lambda}{1-\varepsilon}\Big) + \frac{\lambda^2}{2\varepsilon(1-\sqrt{\theta})^2} M(\delta n^{-d})^2 (2\theta)^N$$

for $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and $\lambda \le \varepsilon\theta^{(n-N-1)/2}(1-\sqrt{\theta})$. That is,

$$\frac{1}{2^n} f_n(\lambda) \le (1-\varepsilon)\frac{1}{2^N} f_N\Big(\frac{\lambda}{1-\varepsilon}\Big) + \frac{M\lambda^2\theta^N}{2\varepsilon(1-\sqrt{\theta})^2}$$

for $\lambda \le \delta n^{-d}\varepsilon\theta^{(n-N-1)/2}(1-\sqrt{\theta})$. (Now we may forget the functions $h_N, \dots, h_n$ and release n.) Therefore
(5.11)

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty, \lambda n^d\theta^{-n/2}\to 0+} \frac{1}{2^n\lambda^2} f_n(\lambda) \le \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\frac{1}{2^N} \limsup_{\lambda\to 0+} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} f_N(\lambda) + \frac{M\theta^N}{2\varepsilon(1-\sqrt{\theta})^2}\,.$$

On the other hand, by Prop. 1.6(b),

$$\frac{1}{2^{n-N}} h_n(\lambda) \le (1-\varepsilon) h_N\Big(\frac{\mu}{1-\varepsilon}\Big) + \Big(\frac{\mu^2}{2\varepsilon(1-\sqrt{\theta})^2} + \frac{\lambda}{2}\frac{\theta^{m-N}}{1-\theta}\Big) M(\delta n^{-d})^2(2\theta)^N$$

whenever $m \in \{N+1, N+2, \dots, n-1\}$ is such that $\lambda < \frac{1}{n-m}$ and $\mu \le \varepsilon\theta^{(m-N-1)/2}(1-\sqrt{\theta})$, where $\mu = \frac{\lambda}{1-(n-m)\lambda}$. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2^n} f_n(\lambda) \le (1-\varepsilon)\frac{1}{2^N} f_N\Big(\frac{\lambda}{1-\varepsilon}\cdot\frac{1}{1-(n-m)n^d\delta^{-1}\lambda}\Big) + \\ + \Big(\frac{\lambda^2}{(1-(n-m)n^d\delta^{-1}\lambda)^2 2\varepsilon(1-\sqrt{\theta})^2} + \frac{\delta\lambda}{2n^d}\frac{\theta^{m-N}}{1-\theta}\Big) M\theta^N \end{aligned}$$

provided that $\lambda < \delta n^{-d} \frac{1}{n-m}$ and $\frac{\lambda}{1-(n-m)n^d\delta^{-1}\lambda} < \delta n^{-d} \varepsilon \theta^{(m-N-1)/2}(1-\sqrt{\theta})$. Assuming $\theta^{n-N} \ll \lambda n^d \ll \frac{1}{n}$, we choose m such that

$$(\lambda n^d)^2 \ll \theta^{m-N} \ll \lambda n^d \,,$$

then $(n-m)n^d\delta^{-1}\lambda \ll 1$, $\delta\lambda n^{-d}\theta^{m-N} \ll \lambda^2$ and therefore

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty, \lambda n^{d+1}\to 0+, \lambda n^d \theta^{-n}\to\infty} \frac{1}{2^n\lambda^2} f_n(\lambda) \le$$

$$\le \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \frac{1}{2^N} \limsup_{\lambda\to 0+} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} f_N(\lambda) + \frac{M\theta^N}{2\varepsilon(1-\sqrt{\theta})^2} \,.$$

In combination with (5.11) it gives us

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty, \lambda n^{d+1}\to 0+} \frac{1}{2^n\lambda^2} f_n(\lambda) \le \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \frac{1}{2^N} \limsup_{\lambda\to 0+} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} f_N(\lambda) + \frac{M\theta^N}{2\varepsilon(1-\sqrt{\theta})^2} < \infty \,.$$

This inequality holds for all N large enough; we take $N \to \infty$ and then $\varepsilon \to 0$:

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty, \lambda n^{d+1}\to 0+} \frac{1}{2^n\lambda^2} f_n(\lambda) \le \liminf_{N\to\infty} \limsup_{\lambda\to 0+} \frac{1}{2^N\lambda^2} f_N(\lambda) \,.$$

However, evidently

$$\liminf_{N\to\infty} \limsup_{\lambda\to 0+} \frac{1}{2^N\lambda^2} f_N(\lambda) \le \limsup_{N\to\infty} \limsup_{\lambda\to 0+} \frac{1}{2^N\lambda^2} f_N(\lambda) \le$$

$$\le \limsup_{n\to\infty, \lambda n^{d+1}\to 0+} \frac{1}{2^n\lambda^2} f_n(\lambda) \,,$$

which means that all these numbers are equal. □

Here is the corresponding lower bound.

5.12 Proposition. Let functions $f_n, g_n : (0,\infty) \to [0,\infty]$ satisfy

$$f_{n+1}(\lambda) \ge 2p f_n\Big(\frac{\lambda}{p}\Big) - (p-1) g_n\Big(\frac{\lambda}{p-1}\Big)$$

for all n, λ and $p \in (1,\infty)$. Let $d \in \{0,1,2,\dots\}$. If

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty, \lambda n^d\to 0+} \frac{1}{(2\theta)^n\lambda^2} g_n(\lambda) < \infty \quad \text{for some } \theta \in (0,1) \,,$$

then

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty, \lambda n^{d+1}\to 0+} \frac{1}{2^n\lambda^2} f_n(\lambda) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \liminf_{\lambda\to 0+} \frac{1}{2^n\lambda^2} f_n(\lambda) \,.$$

Proof. Let $\theta, \delta, N, n, h_N, \dots, h_n$ and $C_N, \dots, C_{n-1}$ be as in the proof of Prop. 5.10, then $h_{k+1} \ge (h_k)_-[C_k]$. We use Prop. 1.26(a,b) instead of Prop. 1.6(a,b) and get (similarly to 5.10)

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty, \lambda n^{d+1}\to 0+} \frac{1}{2^n \lambda^2} f_n(\lambda) \ge \limsup_{N\to\infty} \liminf_{\lambda\to 0+} \frac{1}{2^N \lambda^2} f_N(\lambda) \, .$$

However, evidently

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} \liminf_{\lambda\to 0+} \frac{1}{2^N \lambda^2} f_N(\lambda) \ge \liminf_{N\to\infty} \liminf_{\lambda\to 0+} \frac{1}{2^N \lambda^2} f_N(\lambda) \ge$$
$$\ge \liminf_{n\to\infty, \lambda n^{d+1}\to 0+} \frac{1}{2^n \lambda^2} f_n(\lambda) \, ,$$

which means that all these numbers are equal. □

Now we combine the lower and upper bounds, getting a generalization of Prop. 1.28.

5.13 Proposition. Let functions $f_n, g_n : (0,\infty) \to [0,\infty]$ satisfy

$$2p f_n\Big(\frac{\lambda}{p}\Big) - (p-1) g_n\Big(\frac{\lambda}{p-1}\Big) \le f_{n+1}(\lambda) \le \frac{2}{p} f_n(p\lambda) + \frac{p-1}{p} g_n\Big(\frac{p}{p-1}\lambda\Big)$$

for all n, λ and $p \in (1,\infty)$. Assume existence of the limit

$$\lim_{\lambda\to 0+} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} f_n(\lambda) \in [0,\infty)$$

for all n. Let $d \in \{0,1,2,\dots\}$. If

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty, \lambda n^d\to 0+} \frac{1}{(2\theta)^n \lambda^2} g_n(\lambda) < \infty \quad \text{for some } \theta \in (0,1) \, ,$$

then the following limit exists:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty, \lambda n^{d+1}\to 0+} \frac{1}{2^n \lambda^2} f_n(\lambda) \in [0,\infty) \, .$$

Proof. The limit exists, since lim sup and lim inf are equal; indeed, by Prop. 5.10 and 5.12 they are both equal to

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \lim_{\lambda\to 0+} \frac{1}{2^n \lambda^2} f_n(\lambda) < \infty \, .$$

□

Here are two-dimensional counterparts of 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13 and 2.15.

5.14 Proposition. For every splittable random field X and all $r_1, r_2 \in (0,\infty)$ the following limit exists:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty,\lambda n^2\to 0} \frac{1}{4^n\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_0^{2^n r_1} \mathrm{d}t_1 \int_0^{2^n r_2} \mathrm{d}t_2 X_{t_1,t_2} \, .$$

Proof. Let $s_1, s_2 \in (0,1]$. We define functions $f_n : \mathbb{R} \to [0,\infty]$ by

$$f_n(\lambda) = \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \iint_{G_n} X_{t_1,t_2} \, \mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2 \, ,$$

rectangles G_n of area $2^n s_1 s_2$ being

$$G_{2k} = [0, 2^k s_1] \times [0, 2^k s_2] \, , \quad G_{2k+1} = [0, 2^{k+1} s_1] \times [0, 2^k s_2] \, .$$

Note that $f_n(\lambda) \ge 0$ by Lemma 1.29, and $f_n(\lambda) < \infty$ for $|\lambda| \le 2^{-n}$ by (the evident two-dimensional counterpart of) Lemma 2.5.

The rectangle G_{n+1} can be split in two rectangles congruent to G_n (moreover, shifts of G_n) by a line of length $\le 2^{(n+1)/2}$. Prop. 5.8 (in combination with Lemma 1.7) provides R, δ and M such that for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p \in (1,\infty)$,
(5.15)

$$2p f_n\Big(\frac{\lambda}{p}\Big) - (p-1) g_n\Big(\frac{\lambda}{p-1}\Big) \le f_{n+1}(\lambda) \le \frac{2}{p} f_n(p\lambda) + \frac{p-1}{p} g_n\Big(\frac{p}{p-1}\lambda\Big) \, ,$$

where $g_n : \mathbb{R} \to [0,\infty]$ satisfy

$$g_n(\lambda) \le M \cdot 2^{(n+1)/2} \lambda^2 \quad \text{whenever } 2^{(n+1)/2} \ge R \text{ and } |\lambda| \frac{n+1}{2} \ln 2 \le \delta \, .$$

We have

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty,\lambda n\to 0} \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2})^n \lambda^2} g_n(\lambda) \le M \cdot \sqrt{2} < \infty \, .$$

Prop. 5.13 (for $d = 1$) ensures existence of the limit

$$\lim_{n\to\infty,\lambda n^2\to 0+} \frac{1}{2^n\lambda^2} f_n(\lambda) \in [0,\infty) \, .$$

The same argument applied to $(-X)$ gives us $\lim_{n\to\infty,\lambda n^2\to 0-} \frac{f_n(\lambda)}{2^n\lambda^2}$. The two limits are equal, since both are equal to $\lim_{n\to\infty}\big(2^{-n-1} f_n''(0)\big)$.

Given $r_1, r_2 \in (0,\infty)$, we take m and $s_1, s_2 \in (0,1]$ such that $r_1 = 2^m s_1$, $r_2 = 2^m s_2$ and note that

$$\frac{1}{4^n\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_0^{2^n r_1} \mathrm{d}t_1 \int_0^{2^n r_2} \mathrm{d}t_2 X_{t_1,t_2} = 2^{2m} \cdot \frac{1}{2^{2(n+m)}\lambda^2} f_{2(n+m)}(\lambda) \, .$$

□

5.16 Lemma. For every splittable random field X there exist $\sigma \in [0,\infty)$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty,\lambda n^2\to 0} \frac{1}{4^n\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_0^{2^n r_1} \mathrm{d}t_1 \int_0^{2^n r_2} \mathrm{d}t_2 X_{t_1,t_2} = \frac12 \sigma^2 r_1 r_2$$

for all $r_1, r_2 \in (0,\infty)$.

Proof. Similarly to the proof of 2.11 we denote the limit (given by 5.14) by $\varphi(r_1,r_2)$, use Prop. 5.8 for proving additivity in r_2 (for any given r_1), as well as in r_1 (for any given r_2), and conclude that $\varphi(r_1,r_2) = cr_1r_2$. ☐

5.17 Lemma. The convergence in Lemma 5.16 is uniform in $r_1, r_2 \in (0, M)$ for every $M \in (0,\infty)$.

Proof. Similarly to the proof of 2.12 we use the (approximate) additivity in r_2 for any given r_1 (ensured by Prop. 5.8) and get the uniform convergence for $(r_1,r_2) \in A \times (0,M)$ for some measurable set $A \subset (0,2M)$ of Lebesgue measure $> \frac32 M$. Then we use additivity in r_1 (for any given r_2). ☐

5.18 Proposition. For every splittable random field X there exist $\sigma \in [0,\infty)$ such that for every $a \in (0,\infty)$

$$\lim_{\substack{r\to\infty \\ \lambda \log^2 r \to 0}} \frac{1}{ar^2\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_0^r \mathrm{d}t_1 \int_0^{ar} \mathrm{d}t_2 X_{t_1,t_2} = \frac12 \sigma^2 \,.$$

Proof. Follows from Lemma 5.17 similarly to the proof of 2.13. ☐

5.19 Lemma. For every splittable random field X there exist $\sigma \in [0,\infty)$ such that

$$\lim_{\substack{r\to\infty \\ \lambda \log^2 r \to 0}} \frac{1}{r^2\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} f\Big(\frac{t_1}{r}, \frac{t_2}{r}\Big) X_{t_1,t_2} \,\mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \|f\|^2_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^2)}$$

for every function $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ that is a (finite) linear combination of indicators of (bounded) rectangles.

Proof. Similarly to the proof of 2.15, we apply the concatenation argument (supported by 5.8) in t_2, thus getting (via 5.18) functions f of the form $f(t_1,t_2) = \mathbf{1}_{(a,b)}(t_1) f_2(t_2)$ where f_2 runs over step functions. Then we apply the concatenation argument again, this time in t_1. ☐

Here is a two-dimensional counterpart of Th. 5.6 (see also 2.16).

5.20 Theorem. For every $C \in (0,\infty)$ there exist $R \in (1,\infty)$, $\delta > 0$ and $M < \infty$ such that for every C-splittable stationary random field X,

$$\frac{1}{r^2\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_0^r \mathrm{d}t_1 \int_0^r \mathrm{d}t_2 f(t_1,t_2) X_{t_1,t_2} \le M$$

for all $r \in [R,\infty)$, $\lambda \in [-\frac{\delta}{\ln^2 r}, 0) \cup (0, \frac{\delta}{\ln^2 r}]$ and all measurable functions $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to [-1,1]$.

Proof. We consider only $\lambda > 0$ (otherwise turn to $(-f)$). We define functions $\alpha_n : (0,\infty) \to [0,\infty]$ by

$$\alpha_n(\lambda) = \sup_{X,f} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \iint_{G_n} f(t_1,t_2) X_{t_1,t_2} \, \mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2 \, ;$$

here the supremum is taken over all measurable $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to [-1,1]$ and all C-splittable X, and rectangles G_n of area 2^n are as in the proof of 5.14 (for $s_1 = s_2 = 1$). We have $\alpha_n(2^{-n}) \le \mathbb{E}\,|X_0| \le C < \infty$ by (the evident two-dimensional counterpart of) Lemma 2.5. It follows by Lemma 2.3 that

$$\limsup_{\lambda \to 0+} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \alpha_n(\lambda) < \infty \quad \text{for all } n \, .$$

Using the upper bound of (5.15) we get

$$\alpha_{n+1}(\lambda) \le \frac{2}{p} \alpha_n(p\lambda) + \frac{p-1}{p} g_n\Big(\frac{p}{p-1}\lambda\Big) \, ,$$

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty, \lambda n \to 0+} \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2})^n \lambda^2} g_n(\lambda) < \infty \, .$$

By Prop. 5.10 (for $d = 1$),

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty, \lambda n^2 \to 0+} \frac{1}{2^n \lambda^2} \alpha_n(\lambda) < \infty \, .$$

Now the proof is finalized by the argument of the last paragraph of the proof of 2.16. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 5.2. Similarly to the proof of Lemma 2.17, using Th. 5.20 we check that the set of all $f \in L_\infty\big((0,1)\times(0,1)\big)$ satisfying

$$\lim_{\substack{r\to\infty \\ \lambda \log^2 r \to 0}} \frac{1}{r^2\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \int_0^r \mathrm{d}t_1 \int_0^r \mathrm{d}t_2 f\Big(\frac{t_1}{r}, \frac{t_2}{r}\Big) X_{t_1,t_2} = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \|f\|^2_{L_2((0,1)\times(0,1))}$$

is closed. Due to 5.19, it contains all continuous functions. The rest of the proof is similar to the proof of Th. 2. $\square$

Corollaries 5.3 and 5.4 follow from Th. 5.2 in the same way as Corollaries 3 and 4 from Th. 2.

6 An example of a splittable field

Splittability of the random field examined in this section is significant for Sect. 7.

We consider a centered Gaussian complex-valued random field $\xi = (\xi_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}^2}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\,\xi_s\overline{\xi_t} = \exp(-\mathrm{i}s\wedge t - 0.5|s-t|^2)$$

(here $s \wedge t = (s_1, s_2) \wedge (t_1, t_2) = s_1t_2 - s_2t_1$), and the real-valued random field $X = (X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}^2}$ defined by

$$X_t = \alpha \ln|\xi_t| + 0.5\alpha C_{\text{Euler}}\,;$$

an absolute constant $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ will be chosen later. The field satisfies $\mathbb{E}\exp|X_0| < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}\,X_0 = 0$ (see the proof of Prop. 4.1).

6.1 Lemma. X is stationary.

Proof. For every $r \in \mathbb{R}^2$ the random field

$$\big(\exp(\mathrm{i}t\wedge r)\xi_{t+r}\big)_{t\in\mathbb{R}^2}$$

is distributed like ξ, since

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\,\exp(\mathrm{i}s\wedge r)\xi_{s+r}\overline{\exp(\mathrm{i}t\wedge r)\xi_{t+r}} &= \\ = \exp\big(\mathrm{i}s\wedge r - \mathrm{i}t\wedge r - \mathrm{i}(s+r)\wedge(t+r) - 0.5|s-t|^2\big) &= \\ = \exp(-\mathrm{i}s\wedge t - 0.5|s-t|^2) &= \mathbb{E}\,\xi_s\overline{\xi_t}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore the random field $\big(\alpha\ln|\xi_{t+r}| + 0.5\alpha C_{\text{Euler}}\big)_{t\in\mathbb{R}^2} = (X_{t+r})_{t\in\mathbb{R}^2}$ is distributed like X. ☐

We define a map $\Xi : \mathbb{R}^2 \to L_2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ by

$$\Xi(t)(s) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\exp\big(-\mathrm{i}t\wedge s - 0.5|s-t|^2\big)\,.$$

The following fact is well-known, see for instance [6, (7.49)].

6.2 Lemma. $\mathbb{E}\,\xi_s\overline{\xi_t} = \langle\Xi(s), \Xi(t)\rangle$ for $s, t \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

Proof. Using the equality

$$\frac{1}{\pi}\int \exp(\mathrm{i}u\wedge r)\exp(-|r|^2)\,\mathrm{d}r = \exp(-0.25|u|^2)$$

we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\langle \Xi(s), \Xi(t) \rangle = \int \Xi(s)(r)\overline{\Xi(t)(r)}\,\mathrm{d}r = \\
= \frac{1}{\pi}\int \exp(-\mathrm{i}s\wedge r - 0.5|s-r|^2 + \mathrm{i}t\wedge r - 0.5|t-r|^2)\,\mathrm{d}r = \\
= \frac{1}{\pi}\int \exp\bigl(-\mathrm{i}(s-t)\wedge r - |r-0.5(s+t)|^2 - 0.25|s-t|^2\bigr)\,\mathrm{d}r = \\
= \exp\bigl(-0.25|s-t|^2\bigr)\frac{1}{\pi}\int \exp\bigl(-\mathrm{i}(s-t)\wedge(r+0.5(s+t)) - |r|^2\bigr)\,\mathrm{d}r = \\
= \exp\bigl(-0.25|s-t|^2 - 0.5\mathrm{i}(s-t)\wedge(s+t)\bigr)\frac{1}{\pi}\int \exp\bigl(-\mathrm{i}(s-t)\wedge r\bigr)\exp(-|r|^2)\,\mathrm{d}r = \\
= \exp\bigl(-0.25|s-t|^2 - \mathrm{i}s\wedge t\bigr)\exp\bigl(-0.25|s-t|^2\bigr) = \mathbb{E}\,\xi_s\overline{\xi_t}\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

□

We introduce $\Xi_{-,-}, \Xi_{-,+}, \Xi_{+,-}, \Xi_{+,+} : \mathbb{R}^2 \to L_2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ by

$$
\Xi_{a_1,a_2}(t) = \Xi(t)\cdot I_{a_1,a_2}\,, \quad \text{where}
$$

$$
I_{a_1,a_2}(t_1,t_2) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \operatorname{sgn} t_1 = a_1 \text{ and } \operatorname{sgn} t_2 = a_2, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
$$

for $a_1, a_2 = \pm 1$. Clearly,

$$
\mathbb{E}\,\xi_s\overline{\xi_t} = \sum_{a_1,a_2} \langle \Xi_{a_1,a_2}(s), \Xi_{a_1,a_2}(t) \rangle\,.
$$

We construct (on some probability space) four independent centered Gaussian complex-valued random fields ξ_{a_1,a_2} such that

$$
\mathbb{E}\,\xi_{a_1,a_2}(s)\overline{\xi_{a_1,a_2}(t)} = \langle \Xi_{a_1,a_2}(s), \Xi_{a_1,a_2}(t) \rangle
$$

for $a_1, a_2 = \pm 1$; then the field $\sum_{a_1,a_2} \xi_{a_1,a_2}$ is distributed like ξ. Further, we construct (on some probability space) 16 random fields $\xi^{b_1,b_2}_{a_1,a_2}$ ($a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 = \pm 1$) such that

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text{the 16 fields } \xi^{b_1,b_2}_{a_1,a_2} \text{ are independent;} \\
\text{each } \xi^{b_1,b_2}_{a_1,a_2} \text{ is distributed like } \xi_{a_1,a_2}.
\end{gathered}
\tag{6.3}
$$

We define 9 random fields $X^{k,l}$ ($k, l \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$), distributed like X each, by

$$\begin{aligned} X_t^{0,0} &= \alpha \ln \Bigl| \sum_{a_1,a_2=\pm1} \xi_{a_1,a_2}^{a_1,a_2}(t) \Bigr| + 0.5\alpha C_{\text{Euler}} \, , \\ X_t^{b_1,0} &= \alpha \ln \Bigl| \sum_{a_1,a_2=\pm1} \xi_{a_1,a_2}^{b_1,a_2}(t) \Bigr| + 0.5\alpha C_{\text{Euler}} \, , \\ X_t^{0,b_2} &= \alpha \ln \Bigl| \sum_{a_1,a_2=\pm1} \xi_{a_1,a_2}^{a_1,b_2}(t) \Bigr| + 0.5\alpha C_{\text{Euler}} \, , \\ X_t^{b_1,b_2} &= \alpha \ln \Bigl| \sum_{a_1,a_2=\pm1} \xi_{a_1,a_2}^{b_1,b_2}(t) \Bigr| + 0.5\alpha C_{\text{Euler}} \end{aligned}$$

for $b_1, b_2 \in \{-1, 1\}$. In order to prove splittability of X we check Conditions (a1)–(c3) of Def. 5.1. Condition 5.1(a1) is satisfied (as well as (a2)), since the fields $X^{-,-}, X^{-,0}, X^{-,+}$ involve $\xi_{a_1,a_2}^{b_1,b_2}$ for $b_1 = -1$ only, while $X^{+,-}, X^{+,0}, X^{+,+}$ — for $b_1 = +1$ only.

6.4 Lemma. Conditions 5.1(b1,b2,b3) are satisfied.

Proof. According to (6.3), the four fields $\xi_{a_1,a_2}^{+,+}$ are independent and distributed like ξ_{a_1,a_2}; therefore $X^{+,+} \sim X$ (here '$\sim$' means 'distributed like'). The same holds for the four fields $\xi_{a_1,a_2}^{a_1,a_2}$, thus $X^{0,0} \sim X$. Similarly, $X^{k,l} \sim X$ for all $k, l \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$, which is (b1).

According to (6.3), the 8-component field $(\xi_{a_1,a_2}^{-,b_2})_{a_1,a_2,b_2=\pm1}$ is distributed like $(\xi_{a_1,a_2}^{+,b_2})_{a_1,a_2,b_2=\pm1}$. Therefore the triple $(X^{-,-}, X^{-,0}, X^{-,+})$ is distributed like $(X^{+,-}, X^{+,0}, X^{+,+})$ (which is a part of (b2)). Also, $(\xi_{a_1,a_2}^{a_1,b_2})_{a_1,a_2,b_2=\pm1} \sim (\xi_{a_1,a_2}^{+,b_2})_{a_1,a_2,b_2=\pm1}$, since the transformation $(a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2) \mapsto (a_1, a_2, a_1 b_1, b_2)$ leaves (6.3) invariant. Therefore $(X^{0,-}, X^{0,0}, X^{0,+}) \sim (X^{+,-}, X^{+,0}, X^{+,+})$, which completes the proof of (b2); (b3) is similar. $\square$

6.5 Lemma. Conditions 5.1(c1,c2) are satisfied.

Proof. Restricting the field $\xi = (\xi_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}^2} = (\xi_{t_1,t_2})_{t_1,t_2\in\mathbb{R}}$ to the line $t_2 = 0$ we get a process $(\xi_{t,0})_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ distributed like the process ξ of Sect. 4. On the other hand, the field ξ is distributed like the sum $\xi_- + \xi_+$ of two independent fields defined by $\xi_{a_1} = \sum_{a_2} \xi_{a_1,a_2}$. Restricting ourselves to the line $t_2 = 0$ we see that the process $(\xi_{t,0})_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is distributed like the sum $\bigl(\xi_-(t,0) + \xi_+(t,0)\bigr)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ of two independent processes. This decomposition is similar to the decomposition of Sect. 4 (but different; in fact, $\mathbb{E}\, \xi_-(s,0)\overline{\xi_-(t,0)} = \Phi((-s-t)/\sqrt{2}) \exp\bigl(-0.5(s-t)^2\bigr)$ and $\mathbb{E}\, \xi_+(s,0)\overline{\xi_+(t,0)} = \Phi((s+t)/\sqrt{2}) \exp\bigl(-0.5(s-$

$t)^2\big)$. Still, $\sum_k \|\Xi_-(0.25k)\| < \infty$, where $\Xi_-(t) = \Xi_{-,-}(t,0) + \Xi_{-,+}(t,0)$. We introduce four random fields

$$\xi_{a_1}^{b_1} = \sum_{a_2} \xi_{a_1,a_2}^{b_1,a_2}\,;$$

they are independent, and each $\xi_{a_1}^{b_1}$ is distributed like ξ_{a_1}. Also,

$$\begin{aligned} X^{0,0} &= \alpha \ln |\xi_-^- + \xi_+^+| + 0.5\alpha C_{\text{Euler}}\,, \\ X^{+,0} &= \alpha \ln |\xi_-^+ + \xi_+^+| + 0.5\alpha C_{\text{Euler}}\,, \\ X^{-,0} &= \alpha \ln |\xi_-^- + \xi_+^-| + 0.5\alpha C_{\text{Euler}}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

The argument of Sect. 4 applies, giving

$$\mathbb{E} \exp \biggl(\int_{-\infty}^0 |X_{t,0}^{-,0} - X_{t,0}^{0,0}| \, \mathrm{d}t + \int_0^\infty |X_{t,0}^{+,0} - X_{t,0}^{0,0}| \, \mathrm{d}t \biggr) < \infty\,,$$

which is (c1); (c2) is similar. □

In order to verify (c3) we need a two-dimensional counterpart of Theorem 3.1.

6.7 Proposition. Let a number $C \in (0,\infty)$, a measurable set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and Gaussian random fields ξ, η, η' on A be such that

(a) ξ, η, η' are independent;

(b) η and η' are identically distributed;

(c) for all $u, v \in [0,1)$,

$$\sum_{k,l\in\mathbb{Z}:(k+u,l+v)\in A} \bigl(\mathbb{E}\, |\eta(k+u,l+v)|^2 \bigr)^{1/2} \le C\,;$$

(d) for all $u, v \in [0,1)$, $n \in \{1,2,\dots\}$ and $a_{k,l} \in \mathbb{C}$ $(k,l = 0,\dots,n)$,

$$\mathbb{E} \biggl| \sum_{k,l\in\{0,\dots,n\}:(k+u,l+v)\in A} a_{k,l} \bigl(\xi(k+u,l+v) + \eta(k+u,l+v) \bigr) \biggr|^2 \ge \\ \ge \sum_{k,l\in\{0,\dots,n\}:(k+u,l+v)\in A} |a_{k,l}|^2\,.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E} \exp \iint_A \ln^+ \frac{|\xi(t_1,t_2) + \eta'(t_1,t_2)|}{|\xi(t_1,t_2) + \eta(t_1,t_2)|} \, \mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2 \le \exp\bigl(2\pi (C^2 + C) \bigr)\,.$$

The proof is left to the reader; it is completely similar to the proof of Theorem 3.1.

6.8 Lemma. Condition 5.1(c3) is satisfied (for some α).

Proof. We split the given integral over $\mathbb{R}^2$ into 8 integrals according to $\operatorname{sgn} t_1$, $\operatorname{sgn} t_2$ and $\operatorname{sgn}(t_1 - t_2)$. These 8 integrals being identically distributed (by symmetry), we take one of them; using the Hölder inequality and evident symmetries,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\,\exp \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} |X^{0,0}_{t_1,t_2} - X^{\operatorname{sgn} t_1,0}_{t_1,t_2} - X^{0,\operatorname{sgn} t_2}_{t_1,t_2} + X^{\operatorname{sgn} t_1,\operatorname{sgn} t_2}_{t_1,t_2}| \,\mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2 \le \\
&\quad \le \mathbb{E}\,\exp 8 \iint_{t_1>t_2>0} |X^{0,0}_{t_1,t_2} - X^{+,0}_{t_1,t_2} - X^{0,+}_{t_1,t_2} + X^{+,+}_{t_1,t_2}| \,\mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2 \le \\
&\qquad \le \biggl(\mathbb{E}\,\exp 16 \iint_{t_1>t_2>0} |X^{0,0}_{t_1,t_2} - X^{+,0}_{t_1,t_2}| \,\mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2 \biggr)^{1/2} \cdot \\
&\qquad\qquad \cdot \biggl(\mathbb{E}\,\exp 16 \iint_{t_1>t_2>0} |X^{0,+}_{t_1,t_2} - X^{+,+}_{t_1,t_2}| \,\mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2 \biggr)^{1/2} .
\end{aligned}$$

By (6.6),

$$X^{0,0}_{t_1,t_2} - X^{+,0}_{t_1,t_2} = \alpha \ln \frac{|\xi^-_-(t_1,t_2) + \xi^+_+(t_1,t_2)|}{|\xi^+_-(t_1,t_2) + \xi^+_+(t_1,t_2)|} \,.$$

Similarly to Sect. 4,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\,\exp 32\alpha \iint_{t_1>t_2>0} \ln^+ \frac{|\xi^-_-(t_1,t_2) + \xi^+_+(t_1,t_2)|}{|\xi^+_-(t_1,t_2) + \xi^+_+(t_1,t_2)|} \,\mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2 = \\
&\qquad = \mathbb{E}\,\exp \iint_{t_1>t_2>0} \ln^+ \frac{|\tilde\xi(t_1,t_2) + \eta'(t_1,t_2)|}{|\tilde\xi(t_1,t_2) + \eta(t_1,t_2)|} \,\mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2 \,,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde\xi, \eta$ and η' are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde\xi(t_1,t_2) &= 2\xi^+_+\Bigl(\frac{t_1}{\sqrt{32\alpha}}, \frac{t_2}{\sqrt{32\alpha}} \Bigr) \,, \\
\eta(t_1,t_2) &= 2\xi^+_-\Bigl(\frac{t_1}{\sqrt{32\alpha}}, \frac{t_2}{\sqrt{32\alpha}} \Bigr) \,, \\
\eta'(t_1,t_2) &= 2\xi^-_-\Bigl(\frac{t_1}{\sqrt{32\alpha}}, \frac{t_2}{\sqrt{32\alpha}} \Bigr) \,.
\end{aligned}$$

Finiteness of this expectation is ensured by Prop. 6.7 applied to

$$A = \{ (t_1,t_2) : t_1 > t_2 > 0 \}$$

provided that Conditions 6.7(a,b,c,d) are satisfied by $\tilde{\xi}$, η and η' (for some α and C).

Conditions 6.7(a,b) follow from (6.3). Condition (c) is satisfied since

$$\mathbb{E}\,|\eta(t_1,t_2)|^2 = 2^2\mathbb{E}\,\Big|\xi_-^+\Big(\frac{t_1}{\sqrt{32\alpha}},\frac{t_2}{\sqrt{32\alpha}}\Big)\Big|^2 = 4\Big\|\Xi_-\Big(\frac{t_1}{\sqrt{32\alpha}},\frac{t_2}{\sqrt{32\alpha}}\Big)\Big\|^2$$

is exponentially small whenever $t_1 \gg 1$ (irrespective of t_2); here $\Xi_-(t_1,t_2) = \Xi_{-,-}(t_1,t_2) + \Xi_{-,+}(t_1,t_2)$. (The condition $t_1 > t_2 > 0$ is also used.)

In order to check 6.7(d) we consider (for given $u,v \in [0,1)$) vectors

$$x_k = x_{k_1,k_2} = 2\Xi\Big(\frac{k_1+u}{\sqrt{32\alpha}},\frac{k_2+v}{\sqrt{32\alpha}}\Big)$$

and rewrite 6.7(d) in the form

$$\Big\|\sum_k a_k x_k\Big\|^2 \ge \sum_k |a_k|^2\,;$$

here k runs over a finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}^2$. (The condition $k_1+u > k_2+v > 0$ is now irrelevant.) We note that in general

$$\Big\|\sum_k a_k x_k\Big\|^2 \ge \sum_k |a_k|^2\Big(\|x_k\|^2 - \sum_{l\ne k}|\langle x_k,x_l\rangle|\Big)$$

(since $|a_k\overline{a_l}\langle x_k,x_l\rangle| \le 0.5(|a_k|^2+|a_l|^2)|\langle x_k,x_l\rangle|$), therefore the condition

$$\|x_k\|^2 - \sum_{l\ne k}|\langle x_k,x_l\rangle| \ge 1 \quad \text{for all } k$$

is sufficient for 6.7(d).

We have

$$|\langle x_{k_1,k_2},x_{l_1,l_2}\rangle| = 4\exp\Big(-0.5\frac{(k_1-l_1)^2+(k_2-l_2)^2}{32\alpha}\Big)\,.$$

Clearly, $\sum_{l\ne k}|\langle x_k,x_l\rangle| \to 0$ as $\alpha \to 0$, uniformly in k. Choosing α such that $\sum_{l\ne k}|\langle x_k,x_l\rangle| \le 3$ we get $\|x_k\|^2 - \sum_{l\ne k}|\langle x_k,x_l\rangle| \ge 1$, therefore, 6.7(d).

By Prop. 6.7, $\mathbb{E}\exp 32\iint_{t_1>t_2>0}\big(X^{0,0}_{t_1,t_2} - X^{+,0}_{t_1,t_2}\big)^+\,\mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2 < \infty$. By symmetry, $\mathbb{E}\exp 32\iint_{t_1>t_2>0}\big(X^{0,0}_{t_1,t_2} - X^{+,0}_{t_1,t_2}\big)^-\,\mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2 < \infty$, thus, $\mathbb{E}\exp 16\iint_{t_1>t_2>0}|X^{0,0}_{t_1,t_2} - X^{+,0}_{t_1,t_2}|\,\mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2 < \infty$. Similarly, $\mathbb{E}\exp 16\iint_{t_1>t_2>0}|X^{0,+}_{t_1,t_2} - X^{+,+}_{t_1,t_2}|\,\mathrm{d}t_1\mathrm{d}t_2 < \infty$, since

$$X^{0,+}_{t_1,t_2} - X^{+,+}_{t_1,t_2} = \alpha\ln\frac{|\sum_{a_1,a_2}\xi^{a_1,+}_{a_1,a_2}(t_1,t_2)|}{|\sum_{a_1,a_2}\xi^{+,+}_{a_1,a_2}(t_1,t_2)|} = \alpha\ln\frac{|\zeta_-^-(t_1,t_2)+\zeta_+^+(t_1,t_2)|}{|\zeta_-^+(t_1,t_2)+\zeta_+^+(t_1,t_2)|}\,,$$

where $\zeta_{a_1}^{b_1} = \sum_{a_2} \xi_{a_1,a_2}^{b_1,+}$ are four independent random fields, and each $\zeta_{a_1}^{b_1}$ is distributed like ξ_{a_1}.

$\square$

6.9 Remark. Similarity between Sections 4 and 6 is broken near the end; the proof of 6.7(d) is quite different from the proof of 3.1(d). Fourier transform works in Sect. 4 but fails in Sect. 6, since the field ξ is not stationary. This is why $\alpha(\ln|\xi| + \text{const})$ is splittable for α small enough in Sect. 6, while in Sect. 4 it is splittable for $\alpha = 1$ (and in fact for all $\alpha < \infty$, by the same argument). However, it does not matter for Theorems 2 and 5.2, since their conclusions are insensitive to such coefficients.

All conditions of Def. 5.1 are verified, and we conclude.

6.10 Theorem. The stationary random field X is splittable.

7 Random complex zeroes

Theorem 5, Corollary 6 and Corollary 7, formulated in the introduction, are proved in this section.

The random entire function $\psi(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\zeta_k z^k}{\sqrt{k!}}$ (where ζ_k are independent standard Gaussian) is a centered Gaussian complex-valued random field on $\mathbb{C}$ such that $\mathbb{E}\, \psi(z_1)\overline{\psi(z_2)} = \exp(z_1 \overline{z}_2)$ for all $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}$. We define another centered Gaussian complex-valued random field ξ on $\mathbb{R}^2$ by

$$\xi_{t_1,t_2} = \exp\bigl(-0.5(|t_1|^2 + |t_2|^2)\bigr)\psi(t_1 + t_2\mathrm{i})$$

and get

$$\mathbb{E}\, \xi_s \overline{\xi_t} = \exp(-\mathrm{i} s \wedge t - 0.5|s-t|^2)\,,$$

just as in Sect. 6.

By a test function we mean a compactly supported C^2-function $h : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$. Random variables

$$Z(h) = \sum_{z:\psi(z)=0} h(\operatorname{Re} z, \operatorname{Im} z)$$

are investigated in [8] and other works;

$$\mathbb{E}\, Z(h) = \frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} h(t_1,t_2)\, \mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2$$

(an immediate consequence of the Edelman-Kostlan formula), and

$$Z(h) - \mathbb{E}\, Z(h) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} \ln|\xi(t_1,t_2)| f(t_1,t_2)\, \mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2$$

where $f = \Delta h$, that is, $f(t_1, t_2) = \bigl(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t_1^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t_2^2}\bigr) h(t_1, t_2)$.

Given $r \in (0, \infty)$, we introduce

$$h_r(t_1, t_2) = h\Bigl(\frac{t_1}{r}, \frac{t_2}{r}\Bigr), \quad f_r(t_1, t_2) = f\Bigl(\frac{t_1}{r}, \frac{t_2}{r}\Bigr)$$

and note that

$$\Delta h_r = \frac{1}{r^2} f_r \,.$$

By [8, (0.6) and Sect. 3.3],

$$\operatorname{Var} Z(h_r) = \frac{\kappa}{r^2} \|\Delta h\|^2_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^2)} + o\Bigl(\frac{1}{r^2}\Bigr) \quad \text{as } r \to \infty \,,$$

where $\kappa \in (0, \infty)$ is an absolute constant.

Using X and α of Sect. 6 we have $\ln |\xi_{t_1,t_2}| = \frac{1}{\alpha} X_{t_1,t_2} + \text{const}$, thus (taking into account that $\iint f_r(t_1, t_2) \, \mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2 = 0$),

$$Z(h_r) - \mathbb{E}\, Z(h_r) = \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha r^2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} f_r(t_1, t_2) X_{t_1,t_2} \, \mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2 \,.$$

By Theorem 6.10, X is splittable. Theorem 5.2 gives $\sigma \in [0, \infty)$ (an absolute constant) such that

$$\lim_{\substack{r \to \infty \\ \lambda \log^2 r \to 0}} \frac{1}{r^2 \lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} f_r(t_1, t_2) X_{t_1,t_2} \, \mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \|f\|^2_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \,,$$

that is,

$$\lim_{\substack{r \to \infty \\ \lambda \log^2 r \to 0}} \frac{1}{r^2 \lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp 2\pi\alpha r^2 \lambda \bigl(Z(h_r) - \mathbb{E}\, Z(h_r) \bigr) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \|f\|^2 \,,$$

or equivalently,

$$\lim_{\substack{r \to \infty \\ \lambda \log^2 r \to 0}} \frac{1}{r^2 \lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp r^2 \lambda \bigl(Z(h_r) - \mathbb{E}\, Z(h_r) \bigr) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2(2\pi\alpha)^2} \|f\|^2 \,.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{2(2\pi\alpha)^2} \|f\|^2 = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{1}{r^2} \lim_{\lambda \to 0} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp r^2 \lambda \bigl(Z(h_r) - \mathbb{E}\, Z(h_r) \bigr) =$$

$$= \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{1}{r^2} \cdot \frac{1}{2} r^4 \operatorname{Var} Z(h_r) = \frac{\kappa}{2} \|f\|^2 \,,$$

that is, $\sigma = 2\pi\alpha\sqrt{\kappa}$. We get

$$\lim_{\substack{r\to\infty\\ \lambda\log^2 r\to 0}} \frac{1}{r^2\lambda^2} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp r^2\lambda\bigl(Z(h_r) - \mathbb{E}\, Z(h_r)\bigr) = \frac{\kappa}{2}\|f\|^2 \,,$$

which proves Theorem 5.

By Corollary 5.3,

$$\lim_{\substack{r\to\infty, c\to\infty\\ (c\log^2 r)/r\to 0}} \frac{1}{c^2} \ln \mathbb{P}\biggl(\iint f_r(t_1,t_2) X_{t_1,t_2}\, \mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2 \ge c\sigma\|f\|r \biggr) = -\frac{1}{2}\,,$$

that is,

$$\lim_{\substack{r\to\infty, c\to\infty\\ (c\log^2 r)/r\to 0}} \frac{1}{c^2} \ln \mathbb{P}\biggl(2\pi\alpha r^2\bigl(Z(h_r) - \mathbb{E}\, Z(h_r)\bigr) \ge c\sigma\|f\|r \biggr) = -\frac{1}{2}\,.$$

Taking into account that $\sigma = 2\pi\alpha\sqrt{\kappa}$ we get

$$\lim_{\substack{r\to\infty, c\to\infty\\ (c\log^2 r)/r\to 0}} \frac{1}{c^2} \ln \mathbb{P}\biggl(Z(h_r) - \mathbb{E}\, Z(h_r) \ge \frac{c\sqrt{\kappa}\|f\|}{r} \biggr) = -\frac{1}{2}\,,$$

which proves Corollary 6.

By Corollary 5.4, the distribution of $r^{-1} \iint f_r(t_1,t_2) X_{t_1,t_2}\, \mathrm{d}t_1 \mathrm{d}t_2$ converges (as $r \to \infty$) to the normal distribution $N(0, \sigma^2\|f\|^2)$. That is,

$$2\pi\alpha r\bigl(Z(h_r) - \mathbb{E}\, Z(h_r)\bigr) \to N(0, \sigma^2\|f\|^2) \quad \text{in distribution.}$$

and therefore

$$r\bigl(Z(h_r) - \mathbb{E}\, Z(h_r)\bigr) \to N\biggl(0, \Bigl(\frac{\sigma\|f\|}{2\pi\alpha}\Bigr)^2\biggr) = N(0, \kappa\|f\|^2) \quad \text{in distribution,}$$

which proves Corollary 7.

References

[1] P. Billinglsley (1995): *Probability and measure* (third edition), Wiley.

[2] V.I. Bogachev (1998): *Gaussian measures,* AMS.

[3] J. Dedecker, F. Merlevede, M. Peligrad, S. Utev (2007): *Moderate deviations for stationary sequences of bounded random variables,* `arXiv:0711.3924`.

[4] H. Djellout, A. Guillin, L. Wu (2006): *Moderate deviations of empirical periodogram and non-linear functionals of moving average process,* Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. **42**:4, 393–416.

[5] R.S. Ellis (2006): *The theory of large deviations and applications to statistical mechanics,* http://www.math.umass.edu/∼rsellis/pdf-files/Dresden-lectures.pdf

[6] J.R. Klauder, E.C.G. Sudarshan (1968): *Fundamentals of quantum optics,* W.A. Benjamin, Inc.

[7] F. Nazarov, M. Sodin, A. Volberg (2007): *The Jancovici-Lebowitz-Manificat law for large fluctuations of random complex zeroes,* `arXiv:0707.3863`.

[8] M. Sodin, B. Tsirelson (2004): *Random complex zeroes, I. Asymptotic normality,* Israel Journal of Mathematics **144**, 125–149. Also, `arXiv:math.CV/0210090`.

Boris Tsirelson
School of Mathematics
Tel Aviv University
Tel Aviv 69978, Israel

`mailto:tsirel@post.tau.ac.il`
`http://www.tau.ac.il/~tsirel/`